

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER

A
REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME
AND ABROAD

FOR THE YEAR

1889

NEW SERIES

LONDON
RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE
LONGMANS & CO ; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO., LTD
HOULSTON & SONS; SMITH, ELDER, & CO.; E. BUMPUS
H. SOTHERAN & CO.; BICKERS & SON; J. TOOVEY
J. WHELDON; W. WASHBOURNE

1890

PRINTED BY
STOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

Sir Robert Morier and Count Herbert Bismarck—The County Councils—Glasgow Election—Mr. John Morley at Sheffield, and Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham—Lord Wolseley on Conscription—Lord Brassey on Naval Defences—Mr. Morley and Mr. Chamberlain in the North—Lord Rosebery and Sir W. Harcourt on the Round Table Conference—Recess rumours *page* 1

CHAPTER II.

Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—Mr. John Morley's Amendment—The Government Scheme of National Defence—Lord George Hamilton's Programme—Lord Charles Beresford's Criticism—The Estimates for the Navy—Army—Civil Service—Mr. Goschen's Third Budget—The Attacks on the Administration of Ireland and on the Attorney-General—The Parnell Commission—Minor Legislation—The Local Government Bill for Scotland—The Reforms of the House of Lords—Extra-Parliamentary Speeches—Lord Spencer and Mr. Parnell—Lord Salisbury at Watford—The new Radical Party—Death of Mr. John Bright—The Contest in Central Birmingham 23

CHAPTER III.

National Liberal Union—Lords Hartington and Derby at Birmingham—Speeches by Mr. Morley and Mr. A. J. Balfour—The Home Office, and Major Le Caron—Liquor Traffic in India and Africa—Official Salaries—The Falcarragh Evictions—The Naval Defence Bill—Lord Derby at the Liberal Union Club—Nonconformist Unionist Alliance and Mr. A. J. Balfour—Sir W. Harcourt at Bromley—Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—The New Code—University Representation—Welsh Disestablishment—Intermediate Education in Wales—Lord Wolseley on Military Affairs—Political Speeches by Lord Hartington, Sir Henry James, and Mr. John Morley—Perpetual Pensions—Mr. Labouchere and the House of Lords—An Anti-Vivisection Debate—London Coal Dues—Lord Salisbury and the Primrose League—Women's Liberal Federation at the Grosvenor Gallery—Speech from Mr. Parnell—Mr. Goschen at Sheffield—Future Action of the Irish Party—Scotch Local Government Bills—Excessive Sentences—Lord Lytton and the French Exhibition—Irish Drainage Bills—Board of Agriculture—Bimetallism—Resignation of Sir Hercules Robinson—Mr. Goschen and the Liberal Union Club—Mr. Chamberlain at Bacup—The Lord Lieutenantcy of Ireland

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Gladstone's Campaign in Devonshire and Cornwall—Mr. Balfour at Portsmouth—"How to make a Separatist Agitator"—Bye-Elections—Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill—Scotch Universities and Local Government Bills—Army Estimates—Mr. Balfour's Reply to Mr. Gladstone—Board of Agriculture Bill—Irish Drainage Bills—Labour Conference at Berne—Crete—Delagoa Bay Railway—Land Transfer Bill—Alleged Outrages in Armenia—Mr. Goschen at Hanley—Lord Derby on Federal Home Rule—The Olphert Evictions—Presentation to Mr. W. H. Smith—The Freedom of Cardiff and Mr. Gladstone—Royal Grants Debates—Prince of Wales's Children Bill—Mr. Goschen on Disloyalty to Mr. Gladstone—Lord Hartington at City Liberal Club—Mr. Parnell and the Freedom of Edinburgh—The Tithes Bill—Light Railways Bill—Civil Service Estimates—Sir W. Harcourt at Hereford—Mr. Balfour's Reply to Mr. Parnell—Mr. Gladstone's Golden Wedding—Lord Randolph Churchill in the Midlands—Ministers at the Mansion House—Mr Chamberlain on the New Radicals—The Indian Budget—Catholic Education in Ireland—Imperial Federation—Visit of the German Emperor—Mr. Chamberlain on Lord Randolph Churchill. page [129]

CHAPTER V.

The Dockers' Strike—Trades Union Congress—Mr. Chamberlain's Visit to Birmingham—Lord Hartington at Ilkley—Lord R. Churchill in Wales—The Welsh Church—The Liberal-Unionist Conference at Huddersfield—Mr Gladstone on the pending Elections—The Bye-elections—The Unionist Campaign in Scotland—The Armenian Atrocities—The Cretan Insurrection and Foreign Affairs—The Unionists in the South-west—Sir William Harcourt at Carnarvon—Mr. Gladstone at Southport—Unionists and Liberals at Bristol—The Guildhall Banquet—Mr. Balfour at Ipswich—Mr. Goschen at Bristol and Swansea—The Strikes in London and Manchester—Mr. John Morley at the Eighty Club—Lord Rosebery and Sir George Trevelyan in Scotland—The Conservative Conference at Nottingham—Liberal Conference at Manchester—Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone—Mr. Goschen and Mr. Morley in Scotland—Mr. Parnell at Nottingham and Liverpool—State of Parties [177]

CHAPTER VI.

SCOTLAND AND IRELAND [203]

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY [270]

CHAPTER II

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY [295]

CONTENTS.

vii

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|------------|
| EASTERN EUROPE: RUSSIA—TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE | page [320] |
|--|------------|

CHAPTER IV.

| | |
|--|-------|
| MINOR STATES OF EUROPE: BELGIUM—NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—NORWAY—SWEDEN | [339] |
|--|-------|

CHAPTER V.

| | |
|--|-------|
| ASIA: INDIA—AFGHANISTAN—CENTRAL ASIA—CHINA—JAPAN | [368] |
|--|-------|

CHAPTER VI.

| | |
|---|-------|
| AFRICA: EGYPT—SOUTH AFRICA—EAST AFRICA—WEST AFRICA—CENTRAL AFRICA | [408] |
|---|-------|

CHAPTER VII.

| | |
|--|-------|
| AMERICA: UNITED STATES—CANADA—CENTRAL AMERICA—WEST INDIES—SOUTH AMERICA. | [425] |
|--|-------|

CHAPTER VIII.

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| AUSTRALASIA | [451] |
|-----------------------|-------|

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| THE PARNELL COMMISSION | [477] |
|----------------------------------|-------|

PART II.

| | |
|--|--------|
| CHRONICLE OF EVENTS IN 1889 | page 1 |
| RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART IN 1889 | 64 |
| OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS | 115 |
| INDEX | 179 |

ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1889.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

Sir Robert Morier and Count Herbert Bismarck—The County Councils—Glasgow Election—Mr. John Morley at Sheffield, and Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham—Lord Wolseley on Conscription—Lord Brassey on Naval Defences—Mr. Morley and Mr. Chamberlain in the North. Lord Rosebery and Sir W. Harcourt on the Round Table Conference—Recess rumours.

THE unwonted length of the Session of 1888 had not altogether put a stop to political meetings and platform speeches, although in more ways than one it had curbed and restricted the speakers. It was therefore not unnatural that both parties should welcome the rest which the New Year offered. The only question which seemed to present any vital interest—that of the government of Ireland—had been thoroughly threshed out, and the most accomplished orators had been forced to fall back upon well-used lines of argument, and upon hackneyed forms of attack and defence. The aspect, moreover, of politics at home and abroad was so distinctly peaceful that even the "Morier incident" did little more than provoke a smile at Count Herbert Bismarck's discourtesy.

The charge to which the German Foreign Secretary lent a willing ear was too preposterous to be regarded as serious, whilst his brusque reply to a diplomatist of Sir Robert Morier's position and antecedents was sheltered by the unofficial form in which the latter's request for an official denial of the slanders appearing in the *Kölnische Zeitung* had been couched. In order to appreciate the attitude of the German Foreign Office towards Sir Robert Morier, it should be explained that it regarded him as one of the late Emperor Frederick's personal friends, and had

objected to his being sent as Ambassador to Berlin, when the vacancy caused by Lord Ampthill's death had arisen. Sir Robert Morier had subsequently been appointed Ambassador to St. Petersburg, and it pleased the German Foreign Office to attribute to his influence there the weakening of those ties by which it had hoped to bind the Czar and the Russian Chancellerie to a common policy in European affairs. The correspondence, which may be of future interest, was as follows :—

“ British Embassy, St. Petersburg,

“ December 19, 1888.

“ MONSIEUR LE COMTE,—The *Kölnische Zeitung* of Sunday, the 16th inst., which I have just received, contains a scurrilous attack upon me, in which, amongst other charges, it brings that of my having, when Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Darmstadt, in 1870, betrayed the movements of the German army to Marshal Bazaine. I should have treated this outburst with the supreme contempt with which similar libellous attacks on the part of a portion of the German Press have hitherto inspired me, were it not that I chanced, when in England last July, to hear that your Excellency had stated to more persons than one that a German Military Attaché at Madrid had reported that Marshal Bazaine had made to him a so-called revelation in the above sense. I did not do your Excellency the injustice of supposing that you believed in the truth of a story so palpably absurd, and with the imprint of a foul and impossible calumny so stamped upon it as to fall to pieces the moment it was seriously considered, nor insult you by crediting you with a cynicism so abnormal as to suppose that a man honoured with the friendship and confidence of the late Emperor Frederick could have been so unutterably base as to use that confidence and friendship to betray him and his army to the enemy. Nevertheless, I deemed it expedient to write, without loss of time, to Marshal Bazaine, and inquire into the truth of the alleged conversation. I received from him the emphatic denial, a copy of which, together with a copy of my letter to him, I have the honour to enclose herewith.

“ With this documentary proof of the incorrectness of the supposed conversation in your hands, I appeal, without any doubt as to the result, to your Excellency, as a gentleman and man of honour, to cause an immediate contradiction to be inserted in the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of the foul and infamous libel and calumny contained in the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

“ I have the honour to remain, Monsieur le Comte,

“ Your Excellency's obedient humble servant,

(Signed)

“ R. B. D. MORIER.

“ His Excellency Count Bismarck.”

Enclosed in this was the following letter :—

“Madrid, August 8.

“MONSIEUR L'AMBASSADEUR,—Being absent from Madrid to take baths, I was unable to reply to your Excellency's letter on the subject of the alleged military conversation, which is entirely clumsy fancy on the part of its supposed author. I had not the honour of knowing your Excellency before or during the war of '70, and deny, in the most unqualified manner, this apocryphal conversation, so outside all possible probability. I deny having had a conversation of the kind with anyone whatsoever.

“Forgive my bad writing, but my system has been so tried by the moral sufferings I have endured for twenty years that my nerves feel the effects.

“Your kindness to me at Madrid is an agreeable recollection which I do not forget, and I beg your Excellency to accept my best respectful sentiments.

(Signed)

“Marshal BAZAINE.

“His Excellency Sir Robert Morier.”

To Sir R. Morier's letter Count Bismarck replied in a note of which this is a translation :—

“Friedrichsrub, December 25, 1888.

“I have had the honour to receive your Excellency's letter of the 19th inst. I regret that neither its contents nor its tone enable me to comply with your astonishing demand, and to step out of the limits imposed upon me by my official position in regard to the German Press.

“Accept the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

(Signed)

“H. v. BISMARCK.”

With the following rejoinder the correspondence, so far as the public was informed, came to a close :—

“British Embassy, St. Petersburg,

“December 31, 1888.

“M. LE COMTE,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's letter, dated Christmas Day, in reply to mine of the 19th inst., and to state that, as you decline to dissociate yourself, either publicly or privately, from the monstrous calumny of my supposed betrayal of the Crown Prince's army to Marshal Bazaine, or to give publicity to the proofs with which I have furnished you in refutation of the story, I see no other course open to me but to publish our correspondence. For, right or wrong, the belief is general that the Berlin contributor to the *Kölnische Zeitung* derives his information from official quarters, and he himself does his best to produce this impression by appealing to sources of information necessarily secret and official. I do not say that I myself share this belief; but it is sufficient that it exists and is general. I must, therefore, in view

of the refusal contained in your Excellency's letter, appeal under my own name to that publicity which my anonymous calumniators have so treacherously used against me.

"I have the honour to be, M. le Comte, your Excellency's obedient humble servant,

(Signed)

"R. B. D. MORIER.

"P.S.—It is not my intention ever again to notice the attacks of the *Kölnische Zeitung* and other analogous prints. Their refutation will be furnished beforehand by the absurdity of this latest libel, which will discredit any subsequent slanders that may be brought against me.

"His Excellency Count Bismarck."

In his own country Sir Robert Morier's course of action was generally approved, whilst in Germany it was only from the official press that Count Bismarck's action and language met with support. The incident, after much evasion and special pleading on the part of those who had originally spread the calumny, was allowed to drop; and the German Chancellor took an early opportunity of insisting publicly on the need of English co-operation to enable Germany to carry out her schemes of colonisation in East Africa.

The election of the County Councils, the first fruits of the Local Government Act of the previous Session, awakened a certain amount of languid interest throughout the country. In the rural districts the leading landowners readily offered themselves to the electors, and in most instances were returned by substantial majorities over the "advanced reformers" by whom they were opposed. In many counties, however, especially in the Midlands, the tenant-farmers secured a powerful representation, whilst here and there the "faddists" obtained seats. The hope was expressed in many quarters, especially on the side of the Conservatives, that politics should be excluded from these elections. Mr. Gladstone himself supported this wish, but it was soon found to be difficult to observe, especially as Mr. John Morley, Sir George Trevelyan, and others, had strongly advised in a contrary sense. In Wales particularly, the question of Welsh Home Rule was brought prominently to the front, and except in Breconshire a very large majority of councillors were returned of the most advanced Liberal type. In London the list of candidates contained few names of conspicuous talent or achieved reputation. Sir John Lubbock, who headed the poll, and the Earl of Rosebery, both returned for the City of London, were the most noteworthy exceptions. From a political point of view the Reformed or Progressive Liberals claimed to have carried 70 out of the 118 seats; but the most distinctive result of the polling was the general defeat of those candidates who had held seats on the Metropolitan Board of Works, six only of whom found places in

the new Council, whilst thirty-one were summarily rejected. Two ladies, Miss Cobden and Dowager Lady Sandhurst, were also returned, but their right to sit was subsequently challenged, and after an appeal confirming the ruling of the Queen's Bench, they were forced to resign their seats. Amongst others who were successful were Mr. J. Beal, Mr. J. B. Firth, M.P., and Lord Monkswell, names associated with the cause of Municipal Reform. Earl Compton was returned for the Holborn district, which he had vainly attempted to represent in Parliament, and Mr. John Burns, one of the most prominent Socialist leaders of the day, was elected for Battersea.

The first duty devolving on the County Council was the election of aldermen, and considerable discussion arose as to how the co-optative right conferred upon the councillors should be exercised. Those who held that the institution of aldermen was in itself bad, desired to see the whole number taken from the ranks of the existing councillors, whose places would then be filled up in ordinary course, and the whole body would then have passed the ordeal of popular election. On the other side it was urged that there could be no certainty that the vacancies thus created would be filled by councillors holding views identical with the outgoing members, and that in this way the great Liberal majority might be seriously reduced. Another phase of the question, which was more eagerly discussed outside than within the County Council, was to what extent the majority should exercise their power of nominating only such persons for aldermen as held views in accordance with their own. The concession of a proportionate number of seats to the minority was urged upon the leaders of the advanced party—but without avail—the single name of the Earl of Meath, well known for his philanthropic efforts on behalf of the poor of London, being the only one taken from the list put forward by the moderates. The aldermen chosen, however, were all persons of proved ability, and included Lord Lingen, Lord Hobhouse, Mr. Quintin Hogg, Sir T. H. Farrer and Mr. Frederic Harrison, who headed the poll in the order given. One lady—Miss Cons—was also elected. Lord Rosebery was subsequently chosen Chairman, and Sir John Lubbock Vice-Chairman, of the London Council, and to Mr. J. B. Firth, M.P., the Deputy-Chairman, a salary of 2,000*l.* per annum was, after much discussion, ultimately assigned.

Public attention was, however, once more recalled to political questions by the election to the vacancy in Govan division of Lanarkshire, occasioned by the death of Sir William Pearce, the leading member of the "Fairfield Shipbuilding Company," better known under its older title of "John Elder & Co." Sir William Pearce in 1885 had polled the highest Tory vote (3,677) ever recorded in the county; his popularity was doubtless in some measure due to the position he occupied as the greatest employer of labour in the district, and it was scarcely possible that anyone

less fortunately placed would attract an equally large body of supporters. After some hesitation the choice of the Liberal Unionists fell upon Sir John Pender, who received the full support of the Tory vote. His Gladstonian opponent, Mr. John Wilson, a local manufacturer and engineer, after a short but brilliant campaign, carried the seat (Jan. 18) by the very large majority of 1,071; although Sir John Pender's supporters, 3,349, only fell short by 225 of the total polled by Sir William Pearce. The result of this election, of which the Conservative organs in vain attempted to minimise the importance, taken in conjunction with the previous elections for West Edinburgh and the Ayr Burghs, showed that the feeling in South Scotland was flowing in favour of Irish Home Rule. The speeches by which the election was preceded call for no special remark, but its fortuitous coincidence with the evidence given by the convict Delaney before the Parnell Commission, reviving the history of the Phoenix Park murders, and connecting (according to the witness) the Invincibles with the Land League, showed how little practical effect was produced by the proceedings of the Court.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach was the first to break the truce of silence which the parties had imposed upon themselves, but his speech to his constituents at West Bristol (Jan. 14) was chiefly interesting as furnishing a clue to the Government programme for the ensuing Session. He predicted that much of its time would be devoted to the question of our naval defences. He insisted at length on the need of strengthening these forthwith, and even at a considerable cost, laying before his hearers a somewhat alarming balance-sheet of losses to be faced, if the warnings of the present were neglected. With 28,000,000 of soldiers enrolled in the armies of the Continent, there was a great need for a strong navy to preserve our yearly increasing commerce, whilst the return of more prosperous times rendered the present most opportune for taking some obvious precautions.

The regular "stumping" of the country, however, began with Mr. John Morley's speech to a mass meeting at Sheffield (Jan. 22), in which he accentuated still more strongly the Liberal programme he had previously sketched out at Clerkenwell and which had been endorsed by Mr. Gladstone at Limehouse. In the results of the County Council elections he found abundant cause for satisfaction, and argued from them that his proposals were viewed with favour not only in London but in many parts of the country. Foremost among those proposals was the urgent need of some better system for the registration of parliamentary voters. Mr. Morley urged that there should be but one register in counties and boroughs; that the period of residence especially for lodgers should be reduced; that the register should be made up twice a year, and by some responsible public official. To this reform, combined with the adoption of the principle of "one man, one vote," and to shorter Parliaments, he looked for the regeneration

of the Liberal party and its speedy return to power. Replying to the warnings which Sir M. Hicks-Beach had uttered, Mr. Morley declared that the empire did not need to be talked of as if it were some bubble company that needed promoting and puffing. "I look to an empire where the people are as happy and as prosperous as the conditions of their lives allow and as Government can help them to be. We are as little for shirking duties and responsibilities as any of these quarter-deck politicians; but we are going to count the cost. We are going to look before we engage in any great or arduous enterprise, and we will not forget, though we do owe a duty to those under our flag, or who may be under our flag in any part of the world, we do not forget the people of England have to pay the costs of these expeditions." He hoped they were not going to have any sensational outbursts of shipbuilding, but that there would be reasonable proposals and a clear case made out. They would also want to know why those who knew, or ought to know, most about it, told them that they did not get money's worth for their money. "Finally, we shall want to know this—whether we are going to put these new burdens on the shoulders of the taxpayer, and at the same time maintain a system of payment of non-effective officers which is absolutely without a parallel in the military system of any country in the whole world? What is the use of strengthening the navy—right as that may be—so long as you leave a great wound on the flank still open? What is the use of spending these millions, necessary as they may be, if you do not at the same time unite the arts of policy to the arts of power, and reconcile the source of danger and weakness on our western flank?" Turning thus to the inevitable Irish question, he admitted that the alternating results of by-elections produced only perplexity, and that, if for no other reason, the general sense of the nation should be taken upon a matter in which uncertainty was fatal to the prosperity of both England and Ireland. But the most interesting point in Mr. Morley's speech was his admission that the chief difficulty of Irish Home Rule was the concession of executive power to a Government which might be unfriendly to England. Lord Salisbury some time previously had said that, though he could not approve of a separate legislature for Ireland, he could conceive it as a lesser evil because the veto of the Crown might be used to prevent dangerous measures being passed, and that what the Irish Loyalists dreaded was not so much bad legislation as that the Executive Government should fall into rebel hands. All they had to do then, Mr. Morley proceeded, was to devise some plan by which the Irish Executive should not have it in its power to play tricks with this country. He could not conceive that any man would say that it was impossible to devise such checks upon the executive power as would make any apprehension of a hostile navy setting forth from Irish harbours perfectly

chimerical, and such as need not be taken for a moment into account. If Lord Salisbury believed that the Irish were our inveterate enemies, he could not be prepared to hand over to them an indefinite number of millions to buy their land with. Yet this was the final policy of the Government. If the Irish were good enough to be trusted with an indefinite number of millions of our money, they were good enough to be entrusted with power over their own affairs. To go a step further, the end of these land purchase operations was to bring away the landlords, who, according to their own story, were the bulwarks of the English Government. What was the policy of using your millions to bring away your only friends? He invited Mr. Goschen, when he visited Sheffield next month, to answer this question. Contrasting Mr. Gladstone's land purchase scheme with that of the present Government, he said: "By our scheme we were going to lend or possibly to mortgage British credit to our friends. More than that, in our scheme the British State had the security of the whole revenue of Ireland. In this scheme the British State has the security of thousands of scattered and individual patches of land all over Ireland. Secondly, in our scheme the British State has for its debtor the Irish Government, and it was to the interest of the Irish Government to keep its credit high by the discharge of its obligations. In this scheme of the present Government our millions are to be given as scattered and individual rents all over Ireland. Suppose that the Irish are the nation of swindlers, moonlighters, and boycotters that it pleases Lord Salisbury and the Tory party to represent them, how are you going to get your money back? These great transactions too are carried out without any attempt on the part of the Government to deal with the question of arrears. The landlord is able to go to his tenant and say, 'If you agree with me at such and such a price I will remit your arrears: if you do not agree, out you will go.' What is the effect, supposing the landlord and tenant agree to put the arrears into the price? I will tell you what the effect is. It is that your money and mine will be used to pay a higher price for the land than the land is worth. Gentlemen, I do believe that there has never been a more random, a more incoherent policy pursued by an English Government even in Ireland than the policy pursued there now. They tell you they are going to extend local government. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach said so at Bristol. What is the good of extending local government when you are doing your best to irritate and exasperate the men into whose hands local government will come, and who will have the administration of it?" Alluding to the revolutions of the last century in America and France, Mr. Morley concluded: "There is no more upright democracy than the democracy of England. They need to have causes explained to them. It has been necessary to explain this great Irish question to the English

democracy. None of us has spared himself in the effort to put the case before you. I am not sparing myself nor sparing you. Will you think over some of the points I have suggested to you? I believe that when in your workshops and in your cottages you cast back your mind's eye over the centuries of wrong, grievous wrong, that Ireland has suffered, you will realise that to you has been given the opportunity of righting this wrong, of giving the Irishmen a chance, and giving them fair play; and I do believe that it is impossible that that opportunity will be lost or will be sacrificed."

To the challenge thrown out in this speech Mr. Chamberlain, in addressing his constituents on the following evening (Jan. 28), made a prompt rejoinder on behalf of the Liberal Unionists. After a brief reference to the part he had played in the negotiations with the Washington Government on the Canadian Fishery question, he turned to Mr. Morley's speech at Sheffield, dealing with it point by point. He denied that either County Council elections or recent Parliamentary elections proved the approaching triumph of the Home Rule cause. For with most of the County Council elections politics had nothing whatever to do; and as to the Parliamentary by-elections, in them Home Rule had fallen into the background, and they had been decided on local considerations, and upon questions of general politics. The fact was that "the Gladstonians had begun to find out that Home Rule, by itself, and unadulterated, was not a name to conjure with, and they had begun to gild the pill." They had been obliged to bring forward a new programme of reforms, purely Scotch and English in their incidence, including such items as disestablishment, free schools, the enfranchisement of leaseholders, and "one man, one vote." He admitted his agreement with these items, but pointed out that while he had advocated them for years, "Mr. Gladstone, who had had every opportunity, had done nothing to advance any one of the reforms which he now used in order to deceive the constituencies." Even now Mr. Gladstone "declined to pledge himself," and was "just as obscure about these matters as he was about his Home Rule policy." He disposed of the claim made by the Gladstonians, that they largely assisted the Government in passing the Local Government Act, by pointing out that "they nearly stifled it in their affectionate embrace." Anticipating the measures to be produced by the Government next session, he looked for a Scotch Local Government Bill, the doing of something more for the poor crofters and cotters of the west of Scotland, and larger measures of national defence. He was not an alarmist, nor "what Mr. Morley politely called a quarter-deck politician," but he thought our vast extension of commerce, and the complete revolution in the means and appliances of modern warfare, made a review of our resources of defence absolutely necessary, and justified some considerable extension of them. He strongly

advocated the principle of free schools, which he thought might be granted in such a form as not to interfere with the religious difficulty nor to add to the burden on the rates or to the burden on the subscribers to the voluntary schools. He was also in favour of large measures of land reform in this country, where there were too many large estates and too few small ones, and he recommended the adoption of the principle of the Ashbourne Purchase Act in England, Scotland, and Wales, where the security, unlike the case of Ireland, was excellent. Touching next upon Irish affairs, he expressed his belief that we were entering upon another tranquil period of Irish history—less sensational but infinitely more satisfactory than that through which we had just passed. He praised the “wise, firm, and resolute administration” of Mr. Balfour, which had been conducted equally with the greatest courage and the greatest ability, and without respect of persons, and he attributed the improvement in the state of Ireland partly to this and partly to remedial measures and the rise in the price of produce. He recommended that the Irish people should be assisted in their industries and agriculture by our wealth and credit, and regretted that the Irish members themselves should, for purely factious purposes, have wrecked the drainage schemes which Mr. Balfour brought forward last year. Next turning to the broader issues which Mr. Morley’s policy involved, Mr. Chamberlain warned his hearers that an Ireland under Home Rule would soon be an independent Ireland capable of doing deadly injury to Great Britain, and that the spirit in which Liberals were dealing with Home Rule must shortly be fatal to the empire as a whole. “The timorous spirit,” he went on to say, “which they have shown in this proposal to abandon Ireland to anarchy finds its counterpart in the feeling which sees only wanton and unwise aggression in the constant growth and expansion of the empire. In the history of the past, of its growth and development, Mr. Morley sees nothing to be proud of. He sees only what he calls, with a flourish of tawdry rhetoric, an ‘empire of swagger.’ This great dominion, which has sent forth free nations to every corner of the globe; which holds now under its temperate and orderly sway myriads of men of hostile race, who owe all their hope of tranquillity and prosperity to the continuance of our rule which has spread civilisation; which has developed commerce till it is competent to support the crowded millions that inhabit this small island, that otherwise would be altogether insufficient to support them—this great machine of progress, this potent force in the history of the world, is to Mr. Morley’s philosophic mind only an empire of swagger, an empire whose growth he deplores, but which he cannot restrain. In the seven years during which this great Irish agitation has lasted, and during the latter portion of which Mr. Morley and his friends have been endeavouring to get rid of Ireland, we have added to the dominions

of the Queen a population as large as that of Ireland and an area twenty times as great. He cannot prevent the tree from branching, but he would if he could injure the trunk and strike a fatal blow at the root. The issues which you are called upon to decide are momentous. They involve the principles of our national existence. Apply the policy which these men advocate in Ireland to the government of our great dependency of India. They seem, from signs which have recently been manifest, not disinclined to do so; and if they succeed, I will venture to predict that in a few years the ordered peace of two hundred and fifty millions of our fellow-subjects will give way to the anarchy of the empire of the Mogul, or to the gospel of plunder that was preached by the Mahratta chieftains. It is not, believe me, a policy of Home Rule alone that we have to resent and to resist; it is a policy of universal disintegration."

Almost simultaneously with Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham, the Earl of Derby was expounding at Ashton-under-Lyne the views of another section of the Unionist party. After explaining the objection of the Liberal Unionists to give up the name of Liberals, because it was as Liberals they opposed the new policy, he passed on to the Irish question. He urged strongly his view that the principle involved in granting Home Rule to Ireland was contrary to the doctrines and practice of Liberalism all over the world, for the struggle between the central power on the one hand and local independence on the other was not confined to our own country, but was going on more or less everywhere. He gave examples from Italy, Germany, Switzerland, and America, to prove that, as a rule, throughout the civilised world in modern times, wherever in any country the attempt had been made to weaken the central power of the State in order to strengthen that of some particular province, the Liberal or progressive party had been found on the opposite side. He maintained that if Home Rule were granted to Ireland the "Irish ideas," which Liberal Unionists were censured for not accepting, would be found to include protection in commerce, clericalism pushed to the utmost in education and social questions, and an Ultramontane policy in foreign affairs. He contended, further, that if, unhappily, the English people determined on giving Ireland a legislature of its own, there would be no rest, no halting-place, until the Parliament of Dublin was invested with all the powers of the Parliament of Westminster, and that an Irish Executive would watch for the first opportunity when we were in serious trouble, and then ask for complete freedom. Ireland, he declared, had never been a nation in any recognised sense of the word, except as an English dependency, and he suggested that if the cry of "Ireland for the Irish, Scotland for the Scotch, and Wales for the Welsh," was to be persistently sent up, there might some day be a cry of "England for the English," and if that took a practical form the minor nationalities would not be the gainers.

To grant a limited Home Rule which would not realise the extravagant expectations of the Irish would only be "disgusting one-third of the people in order to disappoint the other two-thirds."

The defence of the Gladstonian policy was left to Lord Rosebery, who at Scarborough on the same day repeated, without adding to them, the stock arguments of its adherents. He denied that they were in any sense separatists, and declared that the Irish question was kept open for party purposes, for "half a dozen statesmen meeting in a room could in a week settle a plan which would be perfectly practicable, and would adjust the relations between Ireland and England."

The Birmingham meeting was rendered still more interesting by the opportunity which it afforded to Mr. Chamberlain of putting forward his education scheme, and to Lord Wolseley of sounding the feelings of a popular meeting on the subject of conscription. With regard to the former topic, Mr. Chamberlain appealed to the Government to establish free schools, which he maintained could be done without interfering with the denominational schools, by adding the usual fees for attendance to the Government grant. He insisted strongly on the waste of time and the mechanical effort implied in the collection of the school-fees, but he failed to point out how the taxpayers would accept a proposal which would involve the addition of at least two millions annually to the Education Vote.

In introducing Lord Wolseley to a large meeting (Jan. 25), Mr. Chamberlain touched upon a totally distinct topic, urging with some warmth the necessity of improving our national defences, and declaring himself in favour of making the volunteers a mobile force, which could take the field independently of the regulars. He especially insisted on the importance of having adequate means to defend our commerce and our colonies, and declared that if we failed in our obligations in this respect we should lose in population, in wealth, in influence, and, above all, in character. He confessed that he had "no sympathy with those who seemed to think that the first duty a patriot owed to his country was to break her in pieces." Lord Wolseley, speaking as a professional man, admitted that he was not satisfied with the position which England occupied at the present moment. All the other great nations were arming to the teeth for a coming struggle, for there was "hanging over us a war cloud greater than any which had hung over Europe before." When that cloud burst, as it surely would, it would mean, not merely as in former times, a contest between two highly-trained armies, but a war of devastation and extinction between great armed nations, whose populations were armed and trained to fight. In order that we might be prepared for such a state of things, he recommended the adoption by England of the principle of military conscription, and he grew enthusiastic in praise of it, not

merely on military and defensive grounds, but for physical reasons, such as its development of the body, and advancement of the general health and well-being of the people. He was strongly in favour of giving two years of military life, with its training and discipline, to every young man in the country. In no section of the press did Lord Wolseley find an echo of his wish to see the principle of conscription adopted in this country, though it was admitted on all sides that from the soldier's and not the politician's point of view the advantages of physical training could scarcely be over-rated.

Whatever feeling for increased armaments existed, it inclined rather towards the views of Lord Charles Beresford, and to the suggestion that any effort should be in the direction of increasing the strength of the navy, of protecting our coasts, and of safeguarding our commerce. That this would be the policy of the Government had been already indicated by Sir M. Hicks-Beach, and it was confirmed by Mr. Goschen in his speech to a large metropolitan audience at Stratford (Jan. 30), where he dealt also at some length with Mr. Morley's "Clerkenwell-cum-Limehouse programme," which he suggested had been only put forward "to find further fuel for the political exigencies of the Irish question." Referring to the measures of the ensuing Session, Mr. Goschen admitted that, notwithstanding his probably "lean budget," the Government would recognise the need of strengthening the navy. This ever-recurring need, after so much expenditure, arose largely from the constant fertility of inventors which rendered old ships and *matériel* obsolete in a very short time. He admitted that our navy must keep pace with our national interests, though it was not necessary to outstrip them or to sink millions unnecessarily before the scientific problems affecting the service were properly worked out.

But by far the most interesting contribution to the discussion was Lord Brassey's non political speech to a large audience of ship-owners and merchants at the Mansion House (Feb. 1), on the actual state of the British navy and the expenditure required to secure its supremacy. At the outset of his remarks Lord Brassey recognised that the *personnel* of the fleet was sufficient in numbers and in the highest state of efficiency, but declared that our ships and guns were the great subjects on which doubts had been expressed, and he proceeded to deal with the case of the ships. He admitted that, unless pressure came from without, there was not much chance of increasing the navy. The rule of the Treasury was to take the expenditure of one year as a basis for the expenditure of the next. The measure of our necessities, however, he contended, must be taken by first looking to the strength and expenditure of other powers. It was our duty to keep our fleet superior to that of any possible enemy, whether a single power or two or more powers combined. Lord Brassey then went on to institute an elaborate comparison between the strength of the British fleet

and that of the fleets of France and Russia, the result being that in battle-ships built during the last ten years we were inferior to the combined strength of the other two powers; but in ships launched before 1878 we had a decided advantage. Our non-effective ships were more capable of repair than were those of France; but on the stocks we were doing nothing, while France and Russia were both at work. In coast defence vessels we were much behind; in harbour defence we had equality; and in armoured cruisers we had an advantage, and could make our present superiority yet more decided if we took in hand the fine ships which our predecessors wisely built of iron, while their neighbours were constructing in wood. In sea-keeping torpedo-vessels we had made a good beginning, but in unarmoured cruisers we were deficient in ships of commanding power and speed. Our expenditure in construction during the present year was nearly as three to two when compared with that of France, but it ought to be as four to two. He pointed out that we had been habitually remiss in the repair of boilers, wherein we had greatly differed from the French, and he recommended that a million and a half should be applied to the essential work of rehabilitating and bringing up to modern requirements numerous ships which were only obsolete in machinery and armament. He further suggested the building of four first-class ironclads and ten vessels of the second-class at a total cost of seven and a half millions, spread over four years. At our present rate of expenditure three millions would be spent in the same period on the building of ironclads. So that four and a half millions more would be required, making a total of six millions, or an extra grant for three years of 1,625,000*l.* a year, and 1,125,000*l.* for the fourth year. Even when that special programme was completed we should go on doing under normal conditions twice as much as the French in the construction of battle-ships.

The state of our navy was obviously too popular a subject to be put aside even by the leaders of the Opposition, and, consequently, Mr. John Morley, in addressing his constituents at Newcastle (Feb. 4), turned away for a moment from the inevitable Irish question to foreshadow the attitude of the Liberal party towards the other problem. The Government, he said, would be called upon to make a clear and full statement of the case for their demands. The case would be closely scrutinised; but it would be scrutinised and approached in a spirit of perfect fairness, and that for all of them the only desire was that the naval supremacy of England should be absolute, that we should be sure that the nation in these leaps and bounds of expenditure got its money's worth for its money, and that if the people were called on to make great sacrifices, at least it would be their duty to make sure that those sacrifices were necessary, and that they received a full return for them in the shape of complete strength and efficiency in the great services concerned.

In dealing with the actual position of the Irish question, Mr. Morley's criticism of the Government derived additional point and force from the tragedy at Gweedore, where Police-Inspector Martin had been murdered on the steps of the village chapel. He maintained that, notwithstanding the Chief Secretary's complacent review of the situation, when addressing the Irish Unionists (Feb. 2), the Government had not advanced one inch towards making Ireland a source of strength instead of a source of weakness to the empire. "Let them look at the Ireland of to-day. What has happened to-day, after the Chief Secretary has said that the feeling of the people towards the police was showing a most manifest improvement?" They knew that the police, while the parish priest was coming away from his religious service—he was not blaming them—were arresting that parish priest. There was a riot. His flock endeavoured to rescue him, and a policeman was killed. There could be no difference of opinion among them as to that. He deplored it; he condemned it; he hated it. He deplored, he hated the whole scene. But the Liberal party did not stop at condemnation. They said, "Let us go to the root of these dismal tragedies; let us change the system; let us bring these popular chiefs like Father McFadden over to order, and law, and government and peace." What did the Government and their party say? They said, "Nay, we will stubbornly persist in the very system which has nursed and fostered this disastrous exclusion of the most popular men in Ireland from law and government."

We may pass by without special notice various speeches made in different parts of the country by the prominent men of all parties. They were for the most part repetitions of old charges and oft-repeated refutations—in both cases assertion most frequently taking the place of argument, and declamation that of practical suggestion. Although the "Clerkenwell-cum-Linehouse programme" was rarely and then briefly touched upon by the Gladstonian speakers, it was nevertheless assumed as official by the party, although, as Sir M. Hicks-Beach pointed out, the realisation of its first point, "Irish Home Rule," would probably occupy several years. The Liberal Unionists—or at least the Radical section—nevertheless seemed to consider it incumbent on them to put forward some greater claim for the support of their constituents than mere opposition to the policy of separation. They were beginning to recognise that neither they nor their ministerial allies had any practical proposals to put forward for the government of Ireland and the solution of Irish difficulties. Mr. Chamberlain accordingly crossed the Border to explain to the Scotch electors the aims and objects of the party of which he was the leader. Addressing a conference of the delegates of numerous Liberal and Radical Unionist Associations, brought together at Glasgow (Feb. 12), Mr. Chamberlain began by expressing considerable doubt as to the reality of the new programme accepted, if not put forward, by

Mr. Gladstone, although he admitted that it might prove useful in attracting recruits who might help to force forward a Home Rule policy. If Mr. Gladstone had been so convinced of the merits of the "one man, one vote" principle in 1885, why, asked Mr. Chamberlain, did he not then give it his support? For himself, Mr. Chamberlain was quite ready when the proper time came to consider a new Reform Bill, although that Reform Bill would contain other things besides the principle of "one man, one vote." There would have to be another redistribution of seats, and there would have to be a good number of seats taken from Ireland, and there might have to be a good number of seats given to districts at present not fairly represented, like London and Scotland. Again, as to disestablishment, "what did Mr. Gladstone say in 1885? Was he then in favour of disestablishment, and are you sure that he is in favour of it now? I am told, and I believe, that the majority of the Dissenters both in England and in Scotland support Mr. Gladstone's present policy, or give to him their personal loyalty. They are quite within their right; but by so doing they are voluntarily and deliberately postponing indefinitely the discussion and the settlement of the question to which they propose to give primary importance. What I think I have told you; what Mr. Gladstone thinks may be gathered from the manifesto to the electors of Midlothian in 1885. Mr. Gladstone then said that, in his opinion, the question was not one of practical politics, and that it would not become so until the proposals, the full proposals, had been developed and had been fully discussed by the people; and there was a general assent on the part of the nation. I do not complain. I think that these conditions are not unreasonable. I think Mr. Gladstone was right to insist upon them. But why should not the same conditions be applied to the Irish question?" As long as Gladstonians were pledged to postpone matters ripe for discussion to a revolutionary project of change in Ireland, it was perfectly absurd to treat these catalogues of reform as serious programmes. This Clerkenwell-cum-Limehouse programme was, as had been said, "a thing of shreds and patches," and this policy should be frustrated by every Liberal Unionist making some sacrifices of extreme views, and giving a clear indication of a constructive policy and beneficial legislation, as the elections at Govan and elsewhere showed that the majority of the people had determined to put aside the Irish question. Among the points in such a policy he mentioned free education, which did not mean that parents should be relieved from the education rate, but that the amount of fees previously received should be made up to the schools out of the general taxation of the country. As to the argument that people would not value what was provided at the expense of the community, he asked if the masses did not value free libraries and art galleries. Another item of a possible Unionist programme

was to lend five millions to give the same facilities to the tenants of Scotland and England that had been given to those of Ireland under the Ashbourne Act, which had been a valuable experiment. He admitted that the question was not so urgent, that Englishmen and Scotchmen had not joined the Plan of Campaign; but, if there was to be a wider distribution of land, why should they object to an experiment which would conclusively show whether the action of the State could stimulate the creation of a greater number of proprietors? In no other way could they replace the yeomen class upon the land. He also wanted to see the Unionist Government doing something more for the crofter and cotter population of Scotland. The people were in a state of great distress owing to circumstances beyond their own control. Their condition had been in the past worse even than that of Irish tenants, and at the same time they had been on the whole, with one or two lamentable exceptions, orderly. Every consideration of justice, of policy, and of Christian charity called upon the Government to afford relief. On the one hand, it would be wise and right to give further assistance to develop local industries, especially the fisheries, and the means of communication; at the same time, by a judicious system of emigration, perhaps with some proposals for migration, the surplus population would be relieved. He was prepared to apply the same principles to Ireland as to Scotland and England. Noticing the improvement in the former country, and saying it was impossible not to lay on the shoulders of Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien the responsibilities for all the miseries which eviction had caused in those counties where they had preached the Plan of Campaign, he pointed out that the great majority of the people had abandoned the agitation and were returning to the ways of peaceful industry, and that this was the opportunity of the Unionist party. Though they would not hand over the minority in Ireland to the enemies of Great Britain, there was much they could do to promote the prosperity of their fellow-subjects in Ireland. "We can, if we will, in the long war between the landlord and tenant classes, transfer the ownership of the soil from the one to the other; we can do for Ireland what Stein and Hardenberg did for Prussia—we can make the cultivators the owners of the soil, and when we have done this I do not know that we have come to the end. These things come first; these things are preliminary; they are precedent to any other reform; but when we have done these I believe that we may safely and wisely crown the edifice and extend to Ireland a system of local government which shall fulfil the expectations of all the most reasonable of Irishmen, a system which shall be applicable also to the needs and to the aspirations of Scotland, of Wales, and of England." In a subsequent speech, Mr. Chamberlain declared that, as far as he was concerned, he would be glad to see the results of the Round

Table Conference on the land question published, in order that the world might see how very nearly the negotiators had come into accord on the subject of Irish land purchase; and that there was no reason that a land measure should be carried by the Conservatives, with the consent of the Gladstonians, without involving the question of Home Rule. At Dundee (Feb. 14) Mr. Chamberlain did his best to arouse a sympathy in Scotchmen for the two millions of Ulstermen to whom they were allied by blood and by a common faith. With regard to the Irish demand for a Parliament which would deal only with local affairs, he argued that to constitute such a body, having no concern with imperial, colonial, and foreign questions, would be to confer a degradation rather than a boon. He was, however, prepared to grant great provincial assemblies in Scotland as well as in Ireland for dealing with private Bill legislation and other local affairs.

The task of replying to these and similar speeches was assigned to Mr. John Morley and Sir George Trevelyan. The former, addressing a large meeting at Portsmouth, declared that the action of the Liberal Unionists scarcely supported their profession of sympathy with the condition of the poor. They had voted with the Conservatives to defeat the Sunday closing provision of the Local Government Act, and had prevented the division of rates between the owner and occupier of property. In dealing with the Irish land purchase scheme, he found a new ground for distrusting it as a panacea for Irish grievances, inasmuch as any such scheme could not include the poorest tenants, "the central fire of Irish disaffection," because the security offered for the payment of instalments would be too bad for any Government to run the risk of lending the purchase-money. On the following day, at the same place, Mr. Morley forecast the coming Session as one in which there would be very little legislation, but a great deal of money expended, and declared that the House of Commons scamped its legislative work because it was "dazed with Ireland." Mr. Morley next referred to the invitation given at Glasgow by Mr. Chamberlain to his colleagues in the Round Table Conference to publish the land scheme which Mr. Chamberlain submitted on that occasion. Mr. Morley had no authority to say to what extent the other members of the conference were prepared to accept that invitation, but maintained that the Gladstonian members of the conference, at all events, had nothing to lose by the publication of every word that passed. But it would be impossible to assent to the proposal to produce any land schemes that were submitted unless at the same time there was published with the fullest particularity every detail of the discussion as to local government schemes as well.

Sir George Trevelyan's reply to Mr. Chamberlain was also given at Glasgow, though probably not to the same audience as that to which the original speech had been addressed. After a

somewhat bitter and personal attack on his former colleague, who in his turn had personally attacked their one-time common leader, Sir George Trevelyan passed on to consider Mr. Chamberlain's demand for free education, declaring himself to be in favour of free education in Government schools, but not in denominational schools, which were managed by authorities independent of the people. Sir George Trevelyan still more strongly condemned Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion that the principles of the Ashbourne Land Purchase Act should be extended to England and Scotland. He regarded that Act as the very worst land purchase scheme ever proposed to the House of Commons. It was an Act to enable great landlords who could not otherwise find purchasers for their estates to find one in the British taxpayer; whilst it would never create, as Mr. Chamberlain imagined, a class of yeomen in England or elsewhere. On the following day (Feb. 14) at Cupar, Fife, Sir George Trevelyan attacked the Liberal Unionists still more vigorously, describing them as "a collection of generals without rank and file;" as "contractors who had engaged to do a great job to which they were quite unequal, and who had no workmen under them;" and as "captains and pilots who had undertaken a long voyage, they did not quite know where."

To sum up the results of Mr. Chamberlain's Scottish campaign, it was questionable whether the production of a new programme altogether compensated for the irritation which found expression in the Conservative ranks at having free education forced upon them by their temporary allies. But the strongest objection to Mr. Chamberlain's demand came not from Conservative statesmen or spokesmen, but from an ex-official who had presided over the working of the various education schemes sanctioned by Parliament. Sir Francis Sandford, speaking dispassionately and with full knowledge, declared that the additional three millions which the taxpayer would have to find every year would be paid by a class whom the Education Acts did not directly benefit, and that it would be difficult to distribute the additional sums to be granted in lieu of fees.

The last note of the Scottish campaign was sounded by Lord Rosebery, who was the chief speaker at a demonstration held at Edinburgh (Feb. 19) by the Scottish Liberal Association, on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, to protest against the arrest of Mr. Carew, M.P., while canvassing for Sir J. Kinloch in East Perthshire. After a few words on the future influence of County Councils and on the working of the Local Government Act, he went on to draw from the recent elections the inference that, because the County Council returns on the "one man, one vote" principle had been favourable to the Radicals, a similar result might be looked for in Parliamentary reactions. Lord Rosebery next congratulated the Scottish Liberal Association on the prominent part it had taken on the disestablishment ques-

tion, adding that the question must be left to the mature judgment of the people themselves, whose will was the only source and strength of an Established Church. Establishments existed for the people, and churches had no divine right to be established. Though the motion for disestablishment had been rejected in the House of Commons in the Session of 1888, the question had taken a step in advance, for they counted national votes as representing national feeling. He then went on to ridicule Mr. Chamberlain's visit to Scotland in the character of chief mourner at the funeral of the Liberal Unionist party in Scotland, and prophesied that his decision "I will sink or swim with the Union" would be unacceptable to the bulk of the Liberals who still followed him. As to the challenge to produce the records of the "Round Table Conference," Lord Rosebery announced that Sir W. Harcourt was preparing a history of the negotiations which would shortly appear. Dealing with the Ulster argument, he said there was always the remedy which seemed to have suggested itself to Lord Beaconsfield, that the two provinces should both enjoy Home Rule, with the proviso that the boundaries of the population of that province in Ireland which was opposed to the unity of Ireland should be made out by those who made the claim. He himself did not believe that the Protestants of Ireland were afraid of the Roman Catholics, or men of Scottish descent afraid of men of Celtic descent. The same arguments were used in the debates on Catholic Emancipation in 1829. The Administration were not fostering respect for law and order in England, Scotland, and Wales. The arrest of Mr. Sheehy just after the Govan election, and now of Mr. Carew at the East Perthshire election, were not the best use to put the Irishmen in Parliament, and it would not find favour with Scotchmen. They had a right to be dissatisfied when they saw the figure of Justice with the bandage torn from her eyes, scales all awry, an Orange robe around her, and a torch of civil war in her hand, with the Unionist mob of politicians in her train. There was no greater political fallacy than that which said that what was good for one was good for another. He was all for Home Rule in due quality, proportion, and degree, suited to the different countries to which it was to be adapted. He was for as much Imperial federation as they could get, and looked to the time when all English races outside the United States would determine to work out their destiny with the domestic power they already possessed, but under the august shadow of the British Empire.

If the Government were in any way responsible for the choice of the moment for effecting Mr. Carew's arrest, it in no way benefited the cause of their supporters in East Perthshire. The Gladstonian Liberal, Sir John Kinloch, was returned by a crushing majority, showing very little reduction from that polled by his predecessor, Mr. Stewart Menzies, in the excitement of the general election of 1885, whilst he rallied five hundred more

voters than had supported the Liberal candidate in 1886, before the Home Rule question had been brought forward.

The promise made on behalf of Sir W. Harcourt and his colleagues to give his version of the Round Table Conference was redeemed at Derby (Feb. 26) some few days later. After some unnecessarily strong language with reference to Mr. Balfour and the *Times* newspaper, Sir W. Harcourt addressed himself to the invitation given by Mr. Chamberlain that the proceedings which took place at the famous Round Table Conference, where an attempt was made to bring about a reconciliation between the Gladstonians and the Liberal Unionists, should be made public. Sir William declared that those who took part in the conference with Mr. Chamberlain had nothing to be ashamed of, and were quite willing that what occurred should be disclosed. He proceeded to explain that the conference arose out of a suggestion which he made to Mr. Chamberlain in consequence of a conciliatory speech delivered by the latter just after the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill in Dec. 1886, and it was arranged that the conference should be held, not as Mr. Chamberlain had originally proposed, on the land question and on Irish local government, but on "the consideration of an Irish legislative body for the transaction of Irish affairs." The proposed conference, sanctioned by Mr. Gladstone, was not to be binding upon anybody, but to ascertain what common ground existed, and to reduce any points of difference to a *minimum*. At the conference Mr. Chamberlain submitted a scheme of land purchase, and was willing to assent to the establishment of an Irish Parliament, with an Irish Executive, founded on the Canadian provincial system. No conclusion was arrived at as to the treatment of Ulster, and while the affairs of the conference were still pending Mr. Chamberlain, in an outside speech, made some "ungracious attacks" upon Mr. Gladstone and his supporters, and upon the Irish members, and followed this up by his famous letter to the *Baptist*, which aroused such strong feeling on the part of the Gladstonian leaders that the conference was abandoned, as it was felt that Mr. Chamberlain must not be allowed, in spite of remonstrances, to "continue vehement attacks upon Mr. Gladstone and his friends and his policy while he was conducting friendly negotiations."

All other topics, however, were overshadowed during the recess by the interest aroused by the Parnell Commission as the contending parties drew to close quarters. The proceedings are recounted at length elsewhere, and it is only necessary here to take note of the profound regret expressed on all sides, except by the bitterest partisans, that a journal enjoying an unique position, and representative in so many ways of English independence, enterprise, and liberality, should have allowed itself to become the dupe of a needy adventurer. The secrecy in which the transactions with the informer Pigott had been shrouded,

under a mistaken sense of honour, was the proximate cause of the *Times*' grievous mistake. Had the source of that journal's information been made known to only a few persons, his true character and antecedents would have been promptly revealed. His career had been one of disgraceful treachery and intrigue, rarely surpassed by the meanest informers; and his death by his own hand was the logical outcome of a life of betrayal. That the revelations before the Parnell Commission were destined to have even a passing practical influence upon political questions, or on the mind of the electorate, is more than doubtful. In Scotland, where newspapers are more carefully read by the bulk of the people than in England or Ireland, the elections for the Govan district and for East Perthshire were held at critical moments in the course of the trial. Nevertheless, at the former, the Gladstonian vote was not reduced by the evidence of the convict Delaney, nor the Unionist vote at the latter by the collapse of the charge founded on the forged letters.

In the early part of the year the rumours once current of Mr. W. H. Smith's retirement from the leadership of the House of Commons were again revived, but, as the result showed, with as little foundation as on the previous occasion. The succession would have lain between Mr. Goschen and Mr. Balfour, but the "National" party to be formed out of the fusion of the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists was not sufficiently advanced to justify the selection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whilst the promotion of the Chief Secretary would so have exasperated, in words at least, the Irish Nationalists, that the course of public business would be still more delayed. Mr. Smith therefore retained the post in which he had shown creditable firmness and honesty of purpose. Any wish he may have had to reform still further the Rules of Procedure was abandoned, and the time thus saved was to be devoted to the more popular discussion of providing means of national defence. On this important question the Cabinet was presumably in possession of the report of the Commission presided over by Lord Hartington, but no authoritative version of its recommendations was made public. On the other hand, an official contradiction was given to the assertion made by a provincial journal that an expenditure of 100,000,000*l.* would be raised by means of a loan to meet the requirements of the navy, and to place the army stores and *matériel* on a satisfactory footing. There was, however, abundant evidence of an increasing interest in the question of national defence. The relative urgency of fortifying London by field works, reorganising the volunteers, protecting our open coast towns, and increasing the number of our cruisers and torpedo boats became the matters of discussion amongst experts and laymen; Lord Wolseley, Sir Lintorn Simmons, and Sir Andrew Clarke giving the weight of their experience in support of the various proposals.

CHAPTER II.

Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—Mr. John Morley's Amendment—The Government Scheme of National Defence—Lord George Hamilton's Programme—Lord Charles Beresford's Criticism—The Estimates for the Navy—Army—Civil Service—Mr. Goschen's Third Budget—The Attacks on the Administration of Ireland and on the Attorney-General—The Parnell Commission—Minor Legislation—The Local Government Bill for Scotland—The Reforms of the House of Lords—Extra-Parliamentary Speeches—Lord Spencer and Mr. Parnell—Lord Salisbury at Watford—The new Radical Party—Death of Mr. John Bright—The Contest in Central Birmingham.

THE re-assembling of Parliament (Feb. 21), postponed until the latest moment compatible with constitutional requirements, was awaited with little curiosity or interest. It had been promised to be a "Scotch Session," and if the Ministry could at the same time carry out some of their promises with regard to national defence, the public at large was willing to be content with a small share of legislation, and was chiefly interested in knowing how the Chancellor of the Exchequer would provide for the demands of the army and navy without imposing a heavy burden on the taxpayers. Mr. Smith, moreover, was under a promise, which he amply redeemed, of procuring opportunities for the full discussion of the Estimates, and thus giving amateur financiers and economists the chance of expounding their views and advocating their reforms. With these prospects a quiet, businesslike Session was anticipated; and there was nothing in the unusually brief Speech from the Throne which seemed to offer a field for serious controversy or opposition. It ran as follows:

"MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

"During the brief period that has elapsed since the close of the last Session, nothing has taken place to affect the cordial relations which exist between myself and other Powers.

"The operations which had been successfully completed in Egypt, a few days before the last Prorogation, have effected the object for which they were undertaken; and I see no ground for apprehending the renewal of disturbance in the neighbourhood of Suakim. The negotiations which I had directed to be opened with the Rulers of Thibet for the purpose of preventing encroachment on my rights over the territory of Sikkim have not as yet been brought to a favourable conclusion; but I hope that further military operations will not be necessary.

"I have consented to take part in a Conference with Germany and the United States at Berlin upon the affairs of Samoa, in continuation of that which was recently assembled at Washington.

"GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

"The estimates for the public service of the year will be laid before you. The unceasing expenditure upon warlike prepara-

tion which has been incurred by other European nations has rendered necessary an increase in the precautions which have hitherto been taken for the safety of our shores and our commerce. The counsels by which other Powers are guided, and which dispose of their vast forces, are at present uniformly friendly to this country; but I have no right to assume that this condition is necessarily secure from the possibility of change.

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

“Some portions of the Bill which was presented to you last year for amending the Local Government of England and Wales were laid aside in consequence of the pressure upon the time of Parliament; and from the same cause it was found to be impossible to enter upon the question of Local Government for Scotland. Bills dealing with these matters will be laid before you.

“Your early attention will be asked to measures for developing the material resources of Ireland; and for amending the constitution of the various tribunals which have special jurisdiction over real property in that country. The statutes which you have recently passed for the restoration of order and confidence in Ireland have already been attended with salutary results.

“Legislative provision will be necessary for executing the Convention into which I have entered for the suppression of bounties on the exportation of sugar; and also for completing the conversion of the Three per Cent. Annuities. The state of the gold coinage has for some years past been the subject of legitimate complaint. A measure for restoring it to a satisfactory condition will be laid before you.

“Though the Commission which I appointed to inquire into the Civil Establishments of the United Kingdom has not yet completed its labours, it has already made a report of much value, and proposals for legislation arising out of that report will be submitted to you.

“Several subjects which I have commended to your care in previous years, but which the increasing burden of your duties has shut out from consideration, will be submitted to you again. In this number will be included measures relating to tithes, for the regulation of the Universities of Scotland, for determining the liability of employers in the case of accidents, for establishing a Department of Agriculture, for cheapening the transfer of land, and for remedying abuses attaching to Joint Stock Companies formed under limited liability.

“I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may be with you in the discharge of your arduous duties.”

In the House of Lords the Address was moved by the Earl of Lonsborough, and seconded by Lord Penrhyn, the former dwelling almost entirely upon the improvement in the condition

of Ireland. Earl Granville, on behalf of the Opposition, took exception to this view of the subject, and urged that the condition of that country was extremely bad; that it had been shown conclusively in the case of Mr. Edward Harrington that the Crimes Act had created new offences; and that Mr. Balfour by his administration of the law had placed himself "in a difficult, and even in an impossible, position." Lord Granville went on to complain of the way in which Mr. Balfour had ridiculed the treatment of Mr. O'Brien; he quoted the opinions of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Beaconsfield that the question of the management of Irish affairs by the Irish themselves would have ultimately to be dealt with; and he dwelt on the significance of recent bye-elections as proving that the Government majority in Parliament was melting away. When Lord Granville sat down the Marquess of Salisbury and the Earl of Selborne both rose, but the leader of the House—who, by ordinary usage, should have followed the leader of the Opposition—gave way, and Lord Selborne proceeded to speak, with remarkable vehemence and strength, in defence of the position he had before taken up, which had been combated by Lord Granville, that the Crimes Act did not create new crime, or make any difference between the law of England and the law of Ireland. The Act, of course, created, like other criminal Acts, specific offences against itself, but its operation was limited to matters which were already criminal and punishable by law. The illegal associations which could be proclaimed under the Act were not made illegal by Act of Parliament—they were illegal in their very nature, and in England, associations for criminal purposes were criminal and required no law to make them so. Lord Selborne concluded with a strong and loudly cheered protest, delivered with the utmost vigour, against "the systematic means used to delude and mislead the people of England as to matters of fact"—means which those who spoke in the name of a great political party, and who had even held high office in the State, did not scruple to use. The Marquess of Salisbury then brought the debate to a close. He answered the various points raised by Earl Granville in connection with foreign affairs—promising papers about Zanzibar and Samoa, pointing out that the Zanzibar blockade had been exceedingly successful, and denying that there had been any intention on the part of this country to seize Samoa. As to Irish affairs, the Premier declined to defend Mr. Balfour, who, he said, was quite competent to defend himself; but he pointed out that it was really very difficult for anyone to "preserve a sufficiently tragic air" over "Mr. O'Brien struggling for his clothes, or Mr. Harrington mourning over his moustache." The fact was that "the Irish people appeared to have entirely lost their sense of humour," and "never seemed to have a notion when they were making themselves ridiculous." The excitement which was being manufactured over Mr. O'Brien and others was "mere theatrical

work for use on platforms at by-elections." The Government never expected to "improve" Mr. O'Brien or Mr. Harrington—all that they hoped to do they were doing—"stealing their following" from such men. He gave statistics to show that the condition of Ireland in regard to agrarian offences had vastly improved, and that the number of offences was now lower, not only than it had been all through the agitation, but lower than it was in 1879 and in 1863. He admitted that recent by-elections had gone against the Government, but he attached no particular importance to them. He declined to forecast the result of a General Election, but he believed that the next Parliament, like the present, would be in favour of the maintenance of the Union, because he had faith in the sound sense of the English people. Even if the Government should be upset, that would not close the controversy. The convictions of the Unionists would not be affected, nor would the Unionist party struggle one bit less earnestly than before to "maintain, or, if need be, to restore, the Union." The Address was then agreed to.

In the House of Commons the business of the evening was not so rapidly despatched. The hope had been entertained that the thoroughly unpractical debate on the Address should be curtailed; but after ten nights had been given up to the discussion of amendments on it, more or less dilatory, it was necessary to invoke the Closure to enable the House to proceed to the despatch of business. The first two nights were devoted to a discursive criticism of the various subjects touched upon in the Queen's Speech. The address was moved by Mr. Shaw-Stewart (*Renfrewshire*), and seconded by Sir John C. Colomb (*Bow and Bromley*), who hoped that the proposed increase of the navy would secure to this country complete protection against the world. Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*), after complimenting the mover and seconder of the Address, complained that the Queen's Speech contained no clear or detailed explanation of recent events at Samoa, and, having regard to what had taken place at Zanzibar, he urged the Government to give early and adequate information as to the condition of affairs in Central Africa. Glancing briefly at the paragraph of the Speech referring to the proposed strengthening of our defences, he spoke of the danger of largely adding to our army and navy, and regretted the absence from the Speech of the customary mention of economy. Coming to the proposed legislation, he expressed, amid some laughter and general cheering, the humble but earnest hope that the Session would end before Christmas Eve, and touching upon the subject of Ireland, he protested against the Address pledging the House to an expression of opinion on contentious matters, and warned the Government that the proposition that recent legislation had had a salutary effect in Ireland would most certainly be disputed; but with the view of saving time he deprecated a casual and im-

perfect discussion of the Irish question, and urged that it should not be mixed up with other matters.

In replying on behalf of the Government Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*) was equally brief in his remarks. He denied that the formal reference to Irish legislation in the Address was unusual, and the Government, he said, would be fully prepared when the time arrived to justify their policy in Ireland. He promised that papers should be presented with regard to Zanzibar, and gave an assurance that every economy would be exercised in the proposed expenditure on armaments. As regarded the length of the Session, it must to a great extent depend, he said, upon the action of the House; but he hoped that, as regarded the present debate, Mr. Gladstone's advice would be followed, and that the House would be allowed to proceed with Mr. Morley's amendment with as little delay as possible.

This suggestion was only partially acceptable to the House, for, when the leader sat down, more than a dozen members rose in succession, some complaining about the omission of certain subjects from the Queen's Speech, and others finding fault with the subjects which had been included. The most interesting criticisms were those which had reference to the state of affairs in Africa, and on this point the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*), gave some interesting information. Replying to Mr. Buchanan's (*Edinburgh, West*) hope that the Government would not permit Portugal to interfere with our missionary stations on the Nyassa, or to close the Zambesi, Sir J. Fergusson admitted that the commercial and missionary stations in Central Africa were entitled to all respect, but he pointed out that they had always been given to understand that they must not look for support to the British Government. As to what had taken place on the Zanzibar coast, he traced the history of the colonisation of Eastern Africa by the Germans and denied the right of this country to interfere with them, either by advice or otherwise. Detailing the negotiations with Germany and the United States with regard to Samoa, he had every confidence that the matter would be satisfactorily arranged at the coming Conference, whilst, as for the Sackville and Morier incidents, they had passed by, he said, without leaving any unpleasant feelings between this country and the United States and Germany.

On the following evening (Feb. 22), which was spent in a still more discursive debate, Sir J. Gorst (*Chatham*), speaking on behalf of the India Office and its relations with East Africa, defended our joint action with Germany in the suppression of the slave-trade, and showed that in the defence of Suakim the Government were only carrying out the policy to which the previous Ministry had committed it. The informal understanding that the discussion on Irish affairs should be reserved for the moving of a definite amendment was broken through by Mr.

Parnell (*Cork City*) on the plea of urgency. He had received a telegram from the Mayor of Kilkenny, in which it was stated that Mr. Carew (*North Kildare*), who had been committed to prison, had been forcibly deprived of his clothes, and left naked in his cell, "lying all day on a plank bed." The Chief Secretary, Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*), replied that he had no official knowledge of Mr. Carew's case; but if he refused to put on the clothes provided by the prison authorities, it was unfair to say that he was left naked in his cell. At the same time, he pointed out that if in any case the "peculiar mania" of refusing to wear the prison garb reached the point of endangering health, it was the duty of the medical officer of the prison to interfere, and he assured the House that exceptional care was taken with Irish prisoners. But he absolutely refused to interfere with the prison rules, and, referring to the Irish members now in prison, he contended that men who advocated crimes of violence were equally guilty with those who committed such crimes.

The only real struggle, however, was to take place over an amendment proposed by Mr. John Morley (Feb. 25), to the effect that "the present system of administration in Ireland is harsh, oppressive, and unjust, that it violates the rights and alienates the affections of the Queen's Irish subjects, and is viewed with reprobation and aversion by the people of Great Britain." It was only natural and proper that the Opposition should take the earliest opportunity of ascertaining whether members, after visiting their constituents, had in any way modified their views as to Mr. Balfour's administration of Ireland; but it was open to doubt whether five nights were necessary for speakers on either side to repeat views to which they had so frequently given expression. Mr. Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*), who opened the debate, marshalled with much oratorical effect the wrongs of Irish members, who first broke the law and then complained of the penalties that breakers of the law incur. Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*), on the other hand, defended himself behind his well-known position that Parliament, in passing the Crimes Act, made no distinction between the men who practised boycotting or withheld the rent, and the men who incited others to these offences. Both speakers flooded the House with a mass of details, most of which were old and familiar; and beyond making a few personal points which aroused the cheers of their respective supporters, neither succeeded in giving the debate a semblance of interest or importance. In this dialectical encounter Mr. Balfour showed himself a brilliant and ready debater, often turning the interruptions to which he was exposed to good profit, whilst never losing either his self-command or the thread of his discourse. Mr. Morley in the course of his speech had attacked Mr. Balfour both for not letting the Irish members wear their own clothes in prison, and also, as this was not permitted, for letting the priests wear their soutane. He scoffed at the intention of the Chief

Secretary to bear healing on his wings to Ireland in the shape of a Drainage Bill, and to minister to a mind diseased in the form of light railways. He described this Parliament as "one long fraud on the constituencies," on the ground that both Conservatives and Liberal Unionists had broken their pledges against Coercion; and ended with threatening the Government with an inquiry into the allegations that they had backed up the *Times'* case with official influence.

In his reply, which was not the less telling because it was as suave as the attack had been acrid, Mr. Balfour touched lightly on Mr. Morley's omission to taunt him with the brutal treatment of Mr. O'Brien, and on the complete disappearance of a long list of calumnies with which the Irish papers had teemed. He pointed out that he had remitted the prison dress in the case of the priests, after some hesitation whether it was or was not legal to do so, because he thought that the prison dress would be in this case a severe additional *class* humiliation, and he showed that the English practice made the same relaxations of rule wherever there was any reason to suppose that religious instincts would be specially offended by prison rules. He showed that Mr. Cunningham Graham had been treated just as the Irish members had been treated. Further, Mr. Balfour contended that Ireland was rapidly improving under the fair administration of the Crimes Act, and took it for granted that whenever the Opposition carried the day and returned to power, the Irish revolutions of '98, '48, and '68 would be virtually renewed and completed, and that social freedom in Ireland would be extinguished.

In the course of the lengthy debate which ensued, Mr. Courtney (*Cornwall, S.E.*) expressed his wish to see the Local Government Act of the previous Session extended to Ireland under certain restrictions, and he maintained that, in spite of many drawbacks and imperfections, there existed in Ireland a system of justice which was working towards freedom. Mr. John Dillon (*East Mayo*), who held an unique position among the Home Rule party, insisted that the improvement in Ireland was due to the successful working of the Plan of Campaign, and still more to the hope inspired in Irishmen by the alliance with Mr. Gladstone and his followers. He further maintained that all boycotters, moonlighters, and other malcontents, poor or rich, were political offenders, and should not, when convicted, be associated with ordinary criminals. On a subsequent day (Feb. 28), Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) gave a somewhat wider interest to the debate, withdrawing it from the niggling criticism of trivial details, and attempting to place before the House the rival policies between which it was called upon to decide. He commenced by analysing Mr. Morley's amendment, pointing out that it consisted of two parts, one condemning the administration of the law in Ireland, and the other proposing an alternative policy; but no

single speaker, he said, had uttered a word on the second part. The debate had consisted solely of a series of petty attacks on the administration of the law, which, he contended, were not proved; and even if they had been, although they might justify the removal of judges and magistrates, would not justify the removal of the Government. The charges, too, against the Chief Secretary were preposterous, and he was sure no one in the House believed them. Glancing at the complaints made as to the prison treatment of Irish members, he pointed out that Mr. O'Brien's statement as to his treatment was directly opposed to the statements made from the Nationalist benches; but as regarded Mr. Harrington, he thought his punishment was excessive, and he suggested, amid the laughter of the Irish members, that the Government should consider whether it was not a case in which the clemency of the Crown might be exercised. But the real kernel of the debate, he said, had not been touched, and if the Opposition had such a policy of conciliation as that suggested in the amendment, he challenged them to produce it. This might be done by resolutions embodying the main issues, as in the case of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and possibly he might be able to accept them. Referring incidentally to the Round Table Conference, he disputed Sir W. Harcourt's statement as to what took place, and he emphatically denied that Mr. Gladstone's Bills were dealt with. The discussion had proceeded with regard to Home Rule on the basis of the extension of Local Government on the lines of the Canadian Constitution, and with regard to the land question, which he maintained was indispensable, on the basis of a plan which he had submitted. On both these questions the members of the Conference were practically in sight of each other: but were they, he asked, in sight of each other now? If so, he urged the Opposition to formulate their views, although he again warned them that the settlement of the land question must be dealt with before any scheme of Home Rule could be granted; while as regarded Ulster, which he admitted presented difficulties, he insisted that Parliament was not entitled to transfer the allegiance of one part of the country to another authority against its will.

Mr. Chamberlain's speech was not without result, for when Mr. Gladstone rose to reply (March 1) on the last evening of the debate, he began his impressive and most statesmanlike speech by discussing the legislative measures of conciliation recommended in the amendment, with special reference to Mr. Chamberlain's speech, and contended, in answer to his suggestion as to resolutions, that the Unionist party were bound first to fulfil their promise given at the general election to deal with the land question. The Opposition had always been ready and anxious to settle that question, but Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, he said, were the creators of the difficulty which they alleged now existed. It was entirely owing to their action in refusing

Mr. Parnell's Arrears Bill that legislation became impossible and led to the Plan of Campaign, which he never approved, but which, he asserted, was the necessary result of the Unionist policy. Dealing with the diminution of crime in Ireland, he admitted that there was an improvement in substantial crime. This, he contended, was not due to coercion, but was the consequence of hope in the Irish people; but he argued that there was no diminution of those crimes which were directly covered by the Crimes Act, which he asserted was not aimed at crime but at combination apart altogether from crime, and at acts which were distinctly sanctioned by the law of England. Next he referred to Mr. Courtney's statement to his constituents that he would vote for inquiry into some of the disputed matters if it were moved for, but he challenged him to take the initiative, and in this connection he taunted the Unionists with advocating steps which, he said, they invariably abstain from supporting with their votes if by so doing they endangered the safety of the Government. Inquiry into the details of prison treatment, he said, would be useless, but the general system now in vogue he condemned with much energy and, contrasting it with the milder treatment of political prisoners under the Tory Government of Sir R. Peel, demanded that the nation, who, he maintained, looked upon it as brutal and contrary to the custom of other nations, should have an opportunity of recording its opinion. In conclusion, he compared the government of Ireland by Dublin Castle from 1834 to 1838—when there were confidence in the magistrates and the judges, a general aversion to crime, and an increase of convictions to committals—with the present Executive, and contended that the action of the resident magistrates was enough to destroy, and, in fact, did destroy, the national confidence. The Government, he admitted, could continue the present system under the Septennial Act, but to prevent the ultimate consummation of the national aspiration was beyond their power.

Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*), after paying a tribute to Mr. Gladstone's moderation, speedily fell back upon the question of the prison treatment of individuals condemned for political offences, arguing that their treatment had been identical under all Governments; and then went on to defend the police and the resident magistrates from the various charges brought against them by the Irish members. Glancing next at Mr. Gladstone's allusion to the rejection of the Arrears Bill, he rejoined by pointing out that Mr. Gladstone never proposed to deal with arrears in 1886, but, on the contrary, was willing to undertake a system of State purchase on the basis of the 20 years' unjust rents, which, according to his present argument, existed. He also ridiculed the notion that failure to deal with arrears had resulted in the present phase of the land question, and, dwelling on the material improvement which had been

effected, he heartily endorsed the firm and resolute course pursued by the Chief Secretary in thwarting the efforts of those who endeavoured to neutralise the good that had been done. As to the taunt that the Unionists had not fulfilled their election pledges, he maintained that their first mandate was to preserve the Union. With regard to local government, he argued that they were entitled to say in what order it should be granted to different parts of the country, and Scotland, he said, was surely entitled to consideration before Ireland; but he denied that the Government intended that local government for Ireland should not be dealt with by the present Parliament.

The only other noteworthy incident of the debate was the speech of Mr. Parnell, who was received with loud and continued cheering, the whole of the Opposition, including the front bench, rising and waving their hats. He supported the amendment mainly as a protest against the vindictive policy pursued by the Government, and warned them that they would have to stand or fall by their present system of coercion. He claimed, however, an amelioration of prison discipline for political offenders for the sake of humbler prisoners, but not for members of Parliament only, because he was satisfied that the Government would not dare to torture to death men in the position of Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Carew. After touching with great moderation and good sense upon Col. Saunderson's threat that 50,000 Ulster men would stubbornly resist any form of Home Rule for Ireland, Mr. Parnell concluded: "We have every confidence that in the near future the people of this country will see that our cause is a just one; and that it is possible to arrange such a system as will permit Ireland to have the power of dealing with all those matters which concern herself, and herself alone, without the slightest shadow of danger or risk to the interests of the empire. All I ask is that you on your side should be willing to consider and deal with this question as if it were an open question; that you should consider how far you can give to Ireland the right to legislate for herself with safety to your own greater, and undoubtedly more overpowering, influences. It is legitimate and right that we, being the smaller country, should endeavour to conciliate you in every possible manner, and yield to you, and agree to such safeguards as you may think necessary or desirable for the security of your own interests. We have always been anxious and willing for this, and we are willing to do so still. I am convinced that our people, knowing that England and Scotland and Wales have for the first time turned the ear of reason to the solution of this question, will steadily resist every incitement to disorder, to turbulence, and to crime; and that they will hold fast in the true way pointed out to them by the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian in 1885, until he gets that chance which we hope and believe will be a near one, both for the sake of Ireland and for the sake of

England, of again touching the great heart of his countrymen."

After a few remarks from the Home Secretary, the House divided, and Mr. Morley's amendment was rejected by 339 to 260 votes, in a remarkably full House, considering the time of year. Although the majority—79—fell short of the numbers obtained by the Ministry in previous sessions, when similar trials of strength on the Irish question had been made, yet there was no evidence that the Government had to any appreciable extent lost the confidence of the House of Commons.

Three more evenings were spent in the discussion of "grievances" before the Address was finally voted. Prof. Stuart (*Shoreditch*) urged the Government (March 4) to initiate legislation for the consolidation and amendment of the sanitary Acts; to which the President of the Local Government Board, Mr. Ritchie (*Tower Hamlets*), replied that the existing Acts, if put into operation, would meet most of the requirements of the case. He held, moreover, that the subject was one with which the County Councils were best fitted to deal. The distress in certain parts of the Highlands and the adjacent islands of Scotland was next debated at considerable length, in the course of which Mr. Chamberlain expressed the belief that the Government might facilitate the creation of purely fishing harbours, and increase and improve the means of communication with them. He was, moreover, satisfied that adequate relief for congested districts would never be obtained without a well-devised scheme of State-aided emigration. Mr. W. H. Smith closed the debate by expressing the readiness of the Government to consider any scheme of emigration which was practicable without confiscation. The right of public meeting in Trafalgar Square was brought forward (March 5) by Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) and supported by a large number of Metropolitan members, including Sir C. Russell (*Hackney, S.*), who disputed the legal power of the Government to interfere with an old customary right. The Attorney-General, Sir R. Webster (*Isle of Wight*), declared that although unlicensed use of the square might be permitted so long as no evil resulted therefrom, it was the duty of the Executive to step in and put an end to the assumed rights when it was found likely that public inconvenience would result from their abuse, and the House ultimately by 188 to 109 votes upheld the views of the law officers of the Crown. Mr. Cuninghame Graham (*Lanarkshire, N.W.*) finally moved an amendment (March 6) regretting the absence from the Queen's Speech of any reference to the social condition of the working classes; but, as Mr. Ritchie at once pointed out that with three Committees sitting, all occupied with branches of this subject, any action on the part of the Government would be premature. Nevertheless, there was a desire on the part of the Opposition to continue the discussion, which was carried on for some time to almost empty benches.

Mr. W. H. Smith at length moved the closure, which was agreed to by 247 to 66 votes, and the Address was ultimately agreed to by 227 to 99, so little support did the Obstructionists receive on their own side of the House.

The way being thus cleared, the Government lost no time in bringing before the House their proposals for improving the means of National Defence, and, accordingly, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord George Hamilton (*Middlesex, Ealing*), on the next day (March 7) proposed in Committee of the whole House the following resolution:—

“It is expedient that a sum not exceeding 21,500,000*l.* be granted for the purpose of building, arming, equipping, and completing for sea vessels for her Majesty’s Navy; and that it is expedient that a sum not exceeding 10,000,000*l.* be issued out of the Consolidated Fund in seven years ending the 31st of March, 1896; and that a sum not exceeding 11,500,000*l.* be issued out of the moneys to be provided by Parliament for the naval service during the five financial years ending the 31st of March, 1894.”

Lord George Hamilton began by assuring the House that the programme of the Government had been decided upon entirely on their own responsibility, independently of the views of the naval experts. Commenting on the measures adopted by other nations, he pointed out that this country during the last fifteen years had obtained greater results in connection with shipbuilding because we had assimilated our expenditure to our financial means. Predicting that, judged by the results of recent years, the next five years would see a large increase in the naval armaments of other countries, he maintained that we ought not to be satisfied until we obtained a navy equal to the navies of any two other European nations. He was no alarmist, but there were two alternatives before the country—either to be satisfied with a lower standard of precaution or to be prepared for increased expenditure; and the Government, he said, had no hesitation in recommending the latter. Adverting to the delays which had occurred in the supply of guns in the past, he said it would not happen again, for arrangements had been completed to insure that the demand of the navy for ordnance would hereafter be met from time to time without delay. Coming to the proposals of the Government, he said it was intended to construct and equip 70 new vessels at a cost of 21,500,000*l.*, of which 10,000,000*l.* would be provided from a special fund to be explained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the remainder would be an addition to the Navy Estimates for four years. Of these 70 ships, all of which were to be completed in four and a-half years from the date of the commencement of the first vessel, eight were to be first-class battleships, with a displacement of 14,000 tons apiece; two second-class battleships, with a displacement of 9,000 tons; nine first-class cruisers, with a displacement of 7,300 tons—vessels of the “Mersey” type, but with a much larger displacement;

29 smaller cruisers of the "Medea" class, with a displacement of 3,400 tons; four smaller cruisers of the "Pandora" class, with a displacement of 2,600 tons; and 18 torpedo gunboats of the "Sharpshooter" type, with a displacement of 735 tons. Of this total rather less than half, comprising four battleships, six first-class cruisers, 17 second-class cruisers, and six torpedo gunboats, were to be built by contract at an approximate cost of 10,000,000*l.*, and the contracts all issued in the course of the ensuing financial year; of the remainder, which would cost in all 11,500,000*l.*, 20 vessels were to be laid down at once in the dockyards—namely, four battleships of the first class and one of the second class, three first-class cruisers, six second-class cruisers, and six torpedo gunboats. The remaining battleship, one of the second class, would be laid down in 1891, and the other ships of various classes would be commenced as soon as the slips were vacated by the launch of the vessels which were to be laid down forthwith, the whole scheme of construction being so arranged that as each battleship was completed there would be completed at the same time the smaller vessels which were designed as her attendant satellites. As regards the designs of the several classes of ships, the First Lord of the Admiralty assured the House that each one of the types selected represented a design which had either given satisfaction or was an improvement upon a well-known and satisfactory ship. The battleships would be the largest war vessels ever constructed in this country—the displacement of the "Nile" and "Trafalgar" being 11,940 tons, as against 14,000 for the new ships. Their speed would be 17½ knots, their coal capacity large, their freeboard high, their armament similar to that of the "Admiral" class, and the disposition of their armour analogous to that of the "Nile" and "Trafalgar." The first-class cruisers of the "Mersey" type, with a displacement nearly twice as great—7,300 tons, against 4,050—would have an increased speed of three knots; that is, their official speed would be 20 knots. The second-class cruisers were intended to be improved "Medeas" with the same speed—namely, 20 knots—but with 600 tons additional displacement and 35 feet greater length. The torpedo gunboats—one of the most useful types in the service—would be an improvement on the "Rattlesnake" with increased displacement and additional speed. The 11,500,000*l.* which was to be expended on the 38 vessels and their armaments in the Government dockyards would be allocated—8,500,000*l.* to engines and hulls, and 2,850,000*l.* to armaments. During the current year 20 vessels would be commenced—namely, four first-class battleships, one second-class battleship, three first-class cruisers, six second-class cruisers, and six torpedo gunboats.

Lord George Hamilton then went on to explain how the necessary cost of the proposed additions would be divided between the annual estimates and a special fund to be provided in a way which he left to be unfolded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

So far as his own department was immediately concerned, the First Lord stated that the shipbuilding vote in the ordinary Estimates would be raised by 615,000*l.*, and if kept at this level would be adequate to provide for the whole of the dockyard portion of the programme in the stipulated time. On the other hand, the ordnance vote would be reduced by 400,000*l.* It was also proposed to fit a considerable number of the existing iron-clads with new boilers and engines, and provision would be made for improving the coaling facilities for our fleet in the Channel, for dredging the Medway, and for adding 1,100 marines, 1,000 stokers, and 900 blue-jackets to the strength of the navy. Including all these sums, the Naval Estimates for the ensuing financial year would show a total increase of 602,000*l.*; but the scheme would carry with it as it progressed a reduction rather than a permanent increase of expenditure. With regard to local defence of the commercial ports, the Government were prepared to consider a proposition for the co-operation of the ports on the basis of a capitation grant for men, some assistance towards the hire of efficient vessels, and inspection, instruction, and guns to be provided by the Admiralty for the purpose of making available for defence the large number of tugs, steamers, and other small vessels connected with the ports. The scheme of the Government, Lord George Hamilton concluded, must be taken as a whole, no portion of which could be cut out without detracting from its efficiency as an entire scheme.

Lord R. Churchill (*Paddington, S.*) rose at once to attack the proposal, before the Chancellor of the Exchequer had an opportunity of explaining the financial part of the arrangements; although it was chiefly to this side of the question that his objections were directed. He nevertheless proclaimed his hostility to the whole policy of the Government, on the ground that to bind the House to a future course of financial action was as improper as it would be ineffectual, although in other cases binding acts of a like nature had been found successful. He also pointed out that in reality the proposals of the Government came to nothing more than an addition of a million a year to be added to the shipbuilding vote for the ensuing four years. In reply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, admitting that the programme was a departure from the usual system of voting money annually, explained that it aimed at insuring the completion of all the ships and their armaments, and the prevention of any alteration in the scheme during the four years over which it was to extend. Coming to his explanation as to how he proposed to raise the ten millions for the proposed Naval Defence Fund, he said the idea of a loan had been abandoned, but the Government proposed a regularity of expenditure extending over a fixed number of years. The ordinary shipbuilding vote in the Navy Estimates would be increased by 600,000*l.* for the next four years and go towards the eleven-and-a-half millions to be spent in the dock-

yards, and the ten millions would be spread over seven years at the rate of 1,430,000*l.* a year.

In the desultory conversation which followed, the front Opposition Bench, represented by Mr. Childers (*Edinburgh, S.*) abstained from any criticism of the programme, in obvious uncertainty as to its reception by the public, naval and financial; and limited himself to asking a few questions about details; but Lord Charles Beresford (*Marylebone, E.*) showed considerable dissatisfaction with the proposals of the Government, which he described as "making much of a phantom addition to the fleet," for it would be easy for any naval minister by lumping together the building programmes of four or five separate years to make a big show. He complained of the fact that nothing had been said about the natural waste of the fleet or of the obsolete ships that had passed out of the service, and he gave notice that he would move an amendment declaring that the fleet of England should be of such a size as to be able to perform all the work entrusted to it against the fleets of any two Powers combined, one of those Powers being France.

It must be admitted that on its first appearance the Government programme failed to evoke any exuberant enthusiasm; but, at the same time, it did not provoke any severe criticism. The *Times* contented itself with saying that the naval programme of the Government was "certain to receive the warm approbation of the country," without giving any reason for its belief. The *Standard*, however, was more explicit, and said: "The considerations which will lead Parliament to welcome the naval programme on its first presentation can only grow in force as the advance towards its accomplishment restores confidence to the nation. Members are not asked to take a step in the dark, or do anything on trust. They have in definite outline before them the work that the Admiralty is determined to accomplish, and can satisfy themselves that the project covers the whole ground, and is not marred by a tendency to useless extravagance on the one side, or to short-sighted thrift on the other. For certain of its features statutory provision is to be made; and though Parliament may repeal what it enacts, there is no likelihood that it will do so in this instance. Every moral and constitutional pledge that the nature of our administrative system allows is given for a continuity of policy. The Cabinet, to put the truth briefly, took guarantees for the steady, unbroken prosecution of their scheme when they decided, in the first instance, to base it on a painstaking and candid examination of the situation as a whole, and to leave no contingency of the future unconsidered. Their work will stand because it is thorough. The House was prompt to recognise this fact. Apart from Lord Randolph Churchill's snappish, and somewhat ignorant, criticisms, there was no symptom of disapproval or of coldness at the extent of the additions which Government think it indispensable to make to

the fleet. Lord Charles Beresford grumbled, on the ground, apparently, that the new shipbuilding programme does not go far enough; but no one had the courage to say that it goes too far."

The *Daily News* found many small flaws in the proposals, and inquired, "Is this fixity of tenure to apply to the ordnance as well as to the vessels? The guns of to-day may within three years become as obsolete as the catapult or the bow and arrow. But then we further ask, is it not quite possible that an indispensable change in the ordnance might not mean an indispensable change in the vessel? Further objection is one of a Parliamentary and constitutional nature. Lord R. Churchill was quite right in saying that the Government propose to pass four years of Navy Estimates all at once. But they propose to do more than that. They propose to pass four years' Estimates by an Act of Parliament. In other words, they propose to leave the Estimates in the hands and at the mercy of the House of Lords. For if at any time within the fixed period the House of Commons should think the yearly appropriation too great and unnecessary, it could only be reduced by another Act of Parliament, which the House of Lords might refuse to pass." And it concluded: "If we might hazard a conjecture as to the policy of the Government, it would be that the immediate underlying purpose was to speak to the country with two voices. One voice was to thrill the Jingo gallery, another to whisper confidence to the tax-paying pit." The *Spectator* took a wider view of the responsibilities of the Government. "With a Radical party foaming at the mouth at the proposal of any increased expenditure at all, and a Parnellite party willing to use any and every occasion to inflict a humiliation on the Government, it would have been madness to propose a standard of naval expenditure which could not be kept up, and which would in all probability soon have been abandoned, rather than moderately reduced. . . . It seems to us that the Government have gone as far as a prudent Government could; and though we would rather have seen the whole 70 ships built and armed in half the time for which they have allowed, they know, what we do not know, the difficulty there would be in hastening on the work, and also the equal or greater difficulty which our possible enemies would have to overcome in hastening on the preparations for attacking us, if to attack us they are seriously inclined."

The provincial organs of public opinion were on the whole more favourable to the Government proposals and less timorous in expressing their opinion. The *Leeds Mercury*, for instance, declared that, "so far as can be judged at first sight, there seems to be a great deal to be said for the manner in which ministers propose to make up the deficiency which they believe exists in the strength of the navy." The *Birmingham Daily Post* urged strongly that the navy must not be made the spirit of faction, and maintained that the fuller the discussion and the more

searching the criticism the better for the due strengthening and maintenance of the national armament. "Behind all official and Parliamentary opinion there is unquestionably in the mind of the country generally a firm conviction that our navy is not nearly strong enough for the work it would have to do in case of war; and upon this basis there is a firm resolution that, cost what it may, the navy must be brought up to an adequate standard. It must be capable of guarding our coasts, of protecting our commerce, of which the actual food of the people constitutes so great a proportion, and of preventing the fleet of a possible enemy from leaving his ports to assail our harbours or to prey upon our merchantmen."

The *Newcastle Chronicle* said, "As presented to Parliament the scheme of the Government seems to us to realise to an unexpected degree, and certainly as far as circumstances would allow it, the idea of liberality without extravagance." On the other hand, the *Liverpool Mercury* stood almost alone in saying, "We look upon the scheme as inexcusably extravagant. There is no necessity, unless the whole naval system has hitherto been a huge sham, for an outlay at all approaching that now projected. The plea that other nations are building ships on a scale of considerable magnitude is a delusion when examined comparatively. . . . The naked truth of the matter is that when we have a Tory Government in this country we have recurring panics and prodigal expenditure. It is a trick of the party, which the services well know and appreciate, to cultivate Jingoism under one form or another for the benefit of their friends in the army and navy, and at the same time to sow the impression that they alone are mindful of the security of the soil of England."

Pending a fuller discussion of the Ministerial scheme, Lord R. Churchill, who had left the Cabinet because of Lord George Hamilton's refusal to reduce the Navy Estimates, published a letter in the *Times* (March 9), in which he announced his intention of opposing the proposed increase of the navy on the ground that the organisation of the Admiralty ought to be reformed before that body should be entrusted with the expenditure of any public money. He continued, "I apprehend that neither the *Times* nor any appreciable section of the public will disagree with the proposition that all schemes purporting to add to the strength of the navy emanating from the Admiralty as at present constituted must be received with the gravest suspicion and mistrust, and subject to the most searching criticism. We all desire to see the British Navy overwhelmingly strong; but we have not the smallest guarantee that the Admiralty can attain that great end; indeed, the guarantees are in a precisely contrary direction. The Admiralty of the present day, in its nature and in its mode of action, is to all intents and purposes precisely the same body as that upon which the *Times*, representing public opinion, has poured forth continually the most severe condem-

nation, and which has been subjected persistently to the most scathing exposure. The Royal Commission now sitting to inquire into the constitution and working of the Admiralty and War Office is a ministerial admission of the truth of this statement of grave significance.

"Yet it is to this condemned and unreformed administration that we are asked to confide an extraordinary expenditure of public money, to go the way, so far as we know, of the almost countless millions which that spendthrift concern has misappropriated in the past. . . .

"Sir, the Government and the public must be prepared for a long and heavy fight in the House of Commons over the proposed expenditure. For my own part I commenced a conflict with the War Office and the Admiralty two years ago, and have sustained it to the best of my ability up to the present time; nor will I abandon it now, when, as it would seem, an immense opportunity is offered of bringing about administrative reform. I pray you use your great influence in favour of a large amount of toleration of Parliamentary criticism of the Admiralty and its policy. In view of the very recent past, so vividly impressed upon the memories of all of us, it cannot be contended that such criticism or even opposition necessarily implies either want of patriotism or disloyalty to the cause of the Union. The taxpayer has some rights to consideration which cannot be sacrificed to ministerial convenience."

As indicative of the widening of the breach already existing between Lord R. Churchill and the party of which he had been for a moment the accepted leader, this letter attracted even more attention than the policy of which it was the censure. The principal supporter of the Government in the London Press wrote: "Unless, in his attitude towards the scheme laid before Parliament for strengthening the naval forces of the Empire, Lord Randolph Churchill is prepared to execute another of those changes of front in which, it must be allowed, he is a great expert, he will assuredly forfeit whatever lingering confidence in his judgment and patriotism may yet be entertained by the more patient and indulgent of his admirers. So far, the course he has chosen to adopt in reference to this important and Imperial project, whether in the House of Commons or out of it, can only be described as utterly unworthy of a public man not consumed by personal acrimony. It is, unfortunately, but too notorious that Lord Randolph is a good hater, and there are few men by whom he has been thwarted for whom he entertains greater aversion than for the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War. Still, it is a pity, if only for the sake of the decencies of public life, that he does not give himself some little trouble to dissemble his antipathy. It shows itself too plainly, even in petty details."

In other quarters it was suggested that Lord R. Churchill, in

anticipation of the loss of the Unionist vote in the next elections, was anxious to secure a majority by appealing to Tory democrats on the intelligible issues of financial economy and administrative reform.

Lord Charles Beresford also wrote to the *Times* on the same day to explain away the idea that he intended to oppose the Government scheme, which he admitted indeed was even better than his own, submitted in the previous December, in that it added more line-of-battle ships to the existing strength of the navy. He went on to explain: "My contention is that the basis and foundation upon which the strength of the navy ought to depend—namely, the requirements of the country for defence—should be made out clearly on similar lines, and signed by those experts who are supposed to give the advice which fathers the speeches of the First Lord of the Admiralty in the House of Commons, and for which advice there is no real responsibility, as has been from time to time so terribly exposed. Because certain facts, figures, and arguments have induced the Government to do a wise, proper, and judicious act, I wish to know why I am to desert the line I have taken up all through—that of getting things done in a common-sense way, instead of by the methods which must be pursued under our present system of administration, which has again and again been proved so expensive and so bad whenever a crisis appears imminent, and for which system (or want of system) the Government, of course, is not responsible."

Simultaneously with the explanation of their naval programme, the Government laid before the House of Commons the Army and Navy Estimates for the ensuing year 1889-90, and with each a printed statement in lieu of the introductory speech on going into Committee. For the navy the total sum asked for was 13,685,000*l.*, being 602,600*l.* in excess of the amount voted for the previous year. The increased expenditure fell for the most part under the headings "shipbuilding," "manning," and "new works." Lord George Hamilton, in his "explanatory statement," took credit for the realisation of his promises made twelve months before with regard to new constructions. In a few instances the performance had fallen short of what was originally hoped for; but this was chiefly due to the delay in the delivery of the heavy guns, and in the supply of steel materials for the cruisers; but, on the other hand, more rapid progress had been made in other directions. The "*Victoria*" and "*Sans Pareil*" had been delivered over by the contractors, and only awaited their 110-ton turret guns; the protected cruisers "*Magicienne*" and "*Marathon*" were ready for delivery; and the "*Bellona*" and seven vessels for Australasian service were far advanced towards completion. Two composite gunboats, six first-class and ten second-class torpedo-boats, armed with quick-firing three-pounders, had also been ordered of the contractors, the former with a guaranteed speed of 22½ knots, and the latter of 16 knots, per hour.

Lord George Hamilton then went on to describe the new designs which would be adopted in the construction of the vessels to be laid down in 1889-90. Of four first-class battleships, one would be armed on the turret and the others on the barbette system, superior in size (displacement about 14,150 tons), speed, and armament, to all preceding battleships in the Royal Navy. The second-class ironclads, of which one would be laid down in the course of the year, would be reproductions on a smaller scale of the first-class barbette ironclads, being in speed and coal endurance their equal, but carrying a somewhat lighter armament and armour of less thickness, with a displacement of about 9,000 tons. Three first-class protected cruisers would be of the "Blake" and "Blenheim" type, but of considerably less size, and of less speed and coal endurance. These vessels, with a displacement of about 7,350 tons, were to have a protective deck of five inches of steel extending over their whole length, as a special precaution against shells and vertical fire. The second-class cruisers, of which it was proposed to construct two during the year, were to be on the type of the "Medea," but somewhat larger, 300 ft. in length with 3,400 tons displacement. These, with four protected cruisers of the "Pandora" class and six torpedo-boats of the "Sharpshooter" class, would make up the work undertaken in dockyards. To enable this work to be begun, and to complete twenty-six out of thirty ships in process of construction, the vote for shipbuilding &c. was to be increased by 615,900l.

Passing next to the question of naval ordnance, the First Lord stated that the transfer of the cost to the Navy Vote had entailed certain difficulties. Nevertheless, the new 4·7-inch quick-firing gun had been brought into use, and during the year ended December 31, 1888, 160 new breech-loading guns had been completed for the navy, including one 16½-inch 111-ton gun, six 18½-inch 68-ton, nine 12-inch 45-ton, and six 9·2-inch 22-ton guns. During the same period 262 14-inch Whitehead torpedoes had been manufactured and issued for naval services.

No new works of great importance had been commenced during 1888-89, but Lord G. Hamilton stated that the following would be practically completed before the end of the financial year: Haulbow-line (extension), the caissons already in place; Chatham Dockyard, new foundry; Gibraltar, accommodation for torpedo boats; Portsmouth, torpedo range, barracks for 400 men (commenced 1889).

The only other large work to be commenced during 1889-1890 was the important dredging of the Medway to allow of the largest men-of-war passing down the river at any high tide, the remainder of the new barracks on Whale Island, which would enable old hulks—very expensive to repair—to be given up, and the continuation of the reconstruction of the large trooping jetty at Portsmouth Dockyard.

The large extension works at Portsmouth were stated to be

nearly completed, and those at Malta were being pushed on vigorously.

The Admiralty, moreover, proposed to increase the number of chief or engine-room and other artificers, stokers, and to a small extent the seaman class, men and boys, and also to add 1,100 to the effective force of the marines, increasing the force of the corps to 14,000. These changes would involve an increase of 275,300*l.* as compared with the extended expenditure of the preceding year.

The debate on the Navy Estimates (March 14) was almost purely formal, the whole policy of the Government having been brought under discussion by the resolution relating to Naval Defence already referred to. Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*), it is true, moved the reduction of the Vote for Wages by 89,500*l.*, representing the wages of 3,000 men, but after a short debate the amendment was negatived by 186 to 73 votes, and when the remaining votes were subsequently brought forward (June 17), they were agreed to with little discussion or opposition. Meanwhile the more important debates on the extended naval programme of the Government had been at various times before the House. In deference, however, to the wishes of the leaders of the Opposition, the formal resumption of the debate had been postponed in order to allow the country to fully appreciate the proposed increase of the public burdens. The form in which the motion was now put (March 25) showed more clearly the actual intentions of the Government, and enabled the Opposition to take specific objection to one or both of the proposals. Lord George Hamilton's motion, was to authorise the expenditure of 21,500,000*l.*—10,000,000*l.* to be issued out of the Consolidated Fund in seven years ending March 31, 1896, and 11,500,000*l.* out of the Navy Estimates during the five years ending March 31, 1894. On behalf of the independent Radicals, Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Haggerston Division*) moved, as an amendment,—"That, having regard to the statements made during the last Session of Parliament by the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War as to the efficiency of the armaments of the country for the purpose of defence, and seeing that the nation was assured in the recent Speech from the Throne that her Majesty's relations with foreign Powers, which were of the most peaceful character last year, remain in the same satisfactory condition, this Committee deems it inexpedient to authorise the expenditure asked for by the Government."

Mr. Cremer had no difficulty in making out a charge of inconsistency against the Government, and the matter of surprise was that he should have found the leaders of his own side (whom he described as neglecting their duty) ready to let slip so favourable an occasion for attacking their opponents. But Mr. Cremer, as a prominent member of the Peace Society, preferred to make his amendment the grounds of an appeal to the Government, to set an example to the other nations of Europe, and by a volun-

tary disarmament put an end to the rivalry in armaments which was both senseless and dangerous.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, premising that no Government in the present day could venture upon a policy of aggression, admitted that the expenditure could only be justified on the ground that it was necessary for our safety, and in this connection he proceeded to argue that, although there was no cause for alarm, it was essential that we should run no risks. If we desired peace to continue, the country must be known to be safe, and our immunity from danger in recent years, he maintained, was due in a large measure to our vast expenditure, which he denied had been wasteful, and we ought not, he said, to rely for our security on our friendly intercourse with other nations. He urged the Committee not to reject the proposals on the ground that there was a peaceful tendency abroad, but to accept them unless it was satisfied that the country was perfectly safe without them. Sir E. Reed (*Carliff District*) objected to the financial part of the scheme, which, he said, inaugurated a principle which, if extended, would seriously interfere with the control of Parliament over expenditure, and in the course of an elaborate argument he contended that the proposals would only result in the construction during the next five years of one ironclad and one cruiser more than would have been built in the ordinary course. The debate was then adjourned, and another week passed without any sign from the Opposition of the line the leaders proposed to take. On the resumption of the debate (April 1), however, Mr. Gladstone endeavoured to induce the Government to divide their resolution into two parts, one dealing with proposed expenditure, and the other with the mode of providing the money. Mr. W. H. Smith declined to enter upon a discussion upon the merits of the proposal, which certainly was not put forth by way of facilitating the work of the administration, but adhered to the resolution as it stood. He complained, however, with justice, that the amendment standing in the name of Mr. Childers, to the effect that the only constitutional mode of providing the money was by an annual vote, should have been put upon the paper three weeks after the original resolution had been submitted. On Mr. Gladstone's suggestion, Mr. Childers agreed to postpone his amendment until the report stage.

Lord Charles Beresford then resumed the debate on Mr. Cremer's amendment. Urging that our danger consisted in being unprepared, he insisted that the Government ought to put before the country definite plans as to how they proposed to put the country into a proper state of defence; and, after a minute technical argument as to the construction and armament of the new ships, he deprecated any undue curtailment of the debate, having regard to the importance of the question, and contended that a larger sum than that asked for would be needed before the country possessed a thoroughly efficient and adequate system of defence.

The difficulties of the Opposition became more apparent when Mr. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) was put forward by the front bench to explain its policy, and its attitude towards Mr. Cremer's amendment; and although his own interpretation of the concluding words of his speech led the House to believe that the amendment would receive his own and his colleagues' support, other counsels seem to have prevailed when the vote came to be taken. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, in fact, in his curiously balanced speech laid himself fairly open to Mr. Forwood's complaint that the House was unable to guess which side of the fence he meant to climb down. He took exception to the method proposed by the Government on the ground of the extreme difficulty of ascertaining what the total cost of their programme, if carried out, would really amount to. He admitted there was cause for steadily and gradually strengthening the navy, which had been going down for some time past; but there was none for hasty and extravagant expenditure. He contended that even after the proposed expenditure our system of naval administration would still be on an unsatisfactory footing, and in the course of a somewhat long and elaborate argument he maintained that the reasons given by the Government for their scheme did not justify it, although he fully recognised the necessity and importance of maintaining our naval supremacy. He disclaimed any sympathy with attempts to frighten the country by mock raids and other misleading experiments; but the Government had been inquiring into the condition of the navy as a result of the debate on the Naval Estimates last year, and he challenged them to state the results of that inquiry, to give definite particulars of what was required, and to tell the House and the country the grounds upon which they had formulated their shipbuilding programme.

The Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Forwood (*Ormskirk, Lancashire*), in reply, boldly met the charge of having changed his opinion with regard to the requirements of the navy. He claimed his right to do so in view of the additional information which the Admiralty had obtained: whilst the experience gained by the naval manœuvres of the previous year had shown the need of a more complete scheme of defence. With regard to the design of the new war-vessels, the Admiralty had consulted the sailor, the constructor, and the artilleryist, and he believed that the results were thoroughly satisfactory. He discussed at some length the details of the proposed expenditure, which, he said, in 1894 would give the country 77 armoured and 88 protected vessels, making a total of 165, while it was estimated that at the same date France would have only 62, Russia 30, Germany 50, and Italy 36 vessels of both classes; and in conclusion he contended that there was no constitutional objection to the proposed expenditure being spread over a series of years.

In like manner Lord George Hamilton argued that the attitude now taken by the Admiralty was quite consistent with

his previous assurances with regard to the state of the navy. "The present Admiralty administration," he said, "had had two parts of a very difficult character to perform. They came into office in 1885, and had had to deal with a programme for the initiation of which they were not responsible. Their business was to give effect to it as economically and as rapidly as they could, and they completed it in a much shorter period than they anticipated. The expenditure connected with the work during the period which had elapsed since then had been very much larger in the first three years than they anticipated, but increased strength had been obtained subsequently to that date. Thus it had been possible to associate an increase of efficiency with a reduction of expenditure. He had not made a single solitary reduction which affected the efficiency of the fleet. In ships, men, and guns we were stronger now than we had been for the last 30 years. The following figures would be the best indication of their past and present policy. One fact brought home to their minds in 1885 was that whether their programme of ship-building was large or small, they must take care to have sufficient money to carry it out economically. There could be no greater waste of money than to have a programme for which they had not the courage to take sufficient money. He would take the money voted for new construction for four years, commencing in 1881-2 and ending in 1884-5. In 1881-2 the amount voted was 1,680,000*l.*; in 1882-3, 1,770,000*l.*; in 1883-4, 1,930,000*l.*; and in 1884-5, 2,242,000*l.* Any member looking at those figures would say that the increase of expenditure must carry with it a continuous increase of output or result. The facts were these. In the first year 14 ships, with a displacement of 41,000 tons, were added to the navy. In the second year the expenditure was higher, and the output went down to 11 ships with 27,000 tons displacement. The next year there were five ships, with a displacement of only 10,000 tons. The year afterwards there were ten ships, with 10,000 tons displacement. There could be only one possible explanation of those figures. Sufficient money in those years was not taken to complete the ships.

With regard to the constitutional point raised by the Opposition, Lord George Hamilton said there was nothing in the Bill which prevented Parliament from having control hereafter of the sum to be voted, but the scheme as proposed would prevent any future Government from interfering with it without a public exposition of its own counter-policy.

The debate, after a somewhat warm discussion between the First Lord of the Admiralty and Sir Edward Reed (*Cardiff*) on the design of the proposed new ships, was brought to a close by Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand Division*) moving the closure, which was carried by 235 to 117 votes. Mr. Cremer's amendment was then put, but found only 85 supporters against 256, and a further division carried Lord George Hamilton's resolution by 251 to

75, showing that the leaders of the Opposition had hesitated to follow the line to which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman had so nearly committed them. They thought, and apparently with reason, that by attacking the financial side of the programme, they might draw off many who would hesitate to hinder the Government in providing adequate defence for the country and its commerce. Mr. Childers' amendment was therefore carefully framed so as to avoid arousing dangerous susceptibilities, and simply aimed at declaring that the cost of building and arming the proposed ships should be met by annual votes in Committee of Supply instead of spreading the outlay over a series of years. In the course of an elaborate argument as to the method of voting money, Mr. Childers pointed out (April 4) that since the Reform Act of 1832 there had been nothing analogous to the present proposal. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, he said, distinctly laid it down last year that the needs of the year ought to be met out of the revenue of the year, and, protesting against any departure from this rule, especially as regarded shipbuilding, he characterised the proposal as flabby and weak-kneed finance, and he objected to it, moreover, because it would stereotype for five years the shipbuilding ideas of the present moment.

Lord G. Hamilton, explaining in some detail how and when the money would be expended, pointed out that, if it had to be voted annually, it would be impossible to carry out the programme. But the object of the Admiralty was to expedite the building of the ships, and if they were enabled to carry out their scheme the vessels would be constructed faster than improvements could come in. He understood that the Opposition approved the proposal to build the 70 ships, but it would be impossible to build them unless the financial scheme was adopted. The Government considered it important to obtain statutory power to carry out the plan, and it would be financial and Parliamentary pedantry, he said, to refuse it.

Mr. Gladstone's speech was hardly up to his level when dealing with financial questions. To a great extent he followed Mr. Childers, whose objections, he declared, had not been answered. He twitted Lord G. Hamilton with characterising as pedantry a *dictum* which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had laid down as a vital principle of finance—that the annual revenue must meet the year's expenditure. Holding that it would be objectionable in any case to withdraw five millions from the control of Parliament, he said it was especially objectionable in the present case, because the withdrawal would be from a future as well as from the present Parliament, which, he prophesied, would be very differently constituted to the present.

He, however, carefully abstained from resisting the demand altogether, although he deemed it excessive. Nevertheless, it having been made on the responsibility of the Ministry, which alone knew the facts, he acted in accordance with all constitu-

tional precedent in not opposing the vote. In reply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, admitting that the financial part of the scheme was a novelty, explained that it was called for by the bitter experience of the past, but it was, he maintained, strictly constitutional and businesslike. The past practice had led to great extravagance, waste, and delay, but in the present case the whole cost had been ascertained and provided for in advance. If the programme had been an ordinary one he admitted that it ought to be met out of the ordinary revenue; but if, as in the present case, it was to make up for the past and anticipate the future, it was perfectly legitimate to spread the cost over a period of years. There were, moreover, precedents for the course proposed by the Ministry, as in the case of Lord Palmerston's fortification votes in 1859-60, and in 1885 a sum of three millions was taken for the strengthening of the navy, not out of the votes, but by suspending the Sinking Fund.

A division was promptly taken and Mr. Childers' amendment was rejected by 158 to 125, showing that the House of Commons did not altogether like the idea of relaxing its control over a great spending department like the Admiralty. When, however, the debate on the resolution had dragged on without any fresh arguments being introduced, the closure was voted on the motion of Lord George Hamilton by 200 to 136, and the resolution was finally passed by 215 to 128 votes. A Bill framed in accordance with the resolution was subsequently brought in (April 8), but its discussion was postponed until after Easter.

An attempt was made (March 14) by Mr. R. W. Duff (*Banffshire*), who for a short time had been Civil Lord of the Admiralty in Mr. Gladstone's last administration, to induce the Admiralty to assume the entire responsibility of providing guns and ordnance stores for the navy. Lord C. Beresford went a step further and advocated the establishment of an ordnance branch as a separate department with a civilian at its head, which should be responsible for everything connected with the designing, the manufacture, and the supply of guns for both the army and navy. The official chiefs of both departments, however, strongly opposed both suggestions on the ground that they would entail great expense without adequate return, and the proposal was rejected by 109 to 51.

The Army Estimates were disposed of far more easily, although showing a considerably increased expenditure. According to the explanatory statement presented by the Secretary of War (Mr. E. Stanhope), the Estimates for 1889-90 showed an expenditure of 17,335,900*l.*, of which 14,322,500*l.* was for effective, and 3,013,400*l.* for non-effective services, being an increase on the previous year of 597,600*l.*; the estimates for 1888-9 including the Ordnance Factories Vote having been 13,710,700*l.* for effective and 3,027,600*l.* for non-effective services.

The main cause of this increase for the year arose from the

provision made for certain colonial garrisons, the falling-off of appropriations in aid, but, above all, from the necessity of pushing forward the re-armament of our regular troops with weapons of the newest pattern.

For this reason the Vote for Warlike Stores and Armaments showed an increase of 394,000*l.*, mainly due to the provision of the new magazine rifle and ammunition and to the re-arming of the Royal Artillery with the new 12-pounder gun. A further sum of 268,000*l.* was taken for machine and quick-firing guns and ammunition in connection with the Imperial Defence Loan. The total addition to the establishment was 2,615 men, nearly the whole of whom were required for strengthening colonial garrisons in view of the new armaments; and a large addition both of artillery and infantry was intended to be made to the garrison of Malta. On the other hand, the Militia (2,039), the Yeomanry (304), and the Volunteers (1,569), all showed a decrease in numbers; but the Secretary of War was able to state that the reports in all cases showed a marked improvement in efficiency, whilst he anticipated that the Reserves would reach 58,300, the highest point hitherto attained, with the prospect of improvement in future years.

In bringing the Estimates before the House of Commons (Feb. 12), and moving the vote for 152,282 men of all ranks, Mr. Stanhope (*Lincolnshire; Horncastle*) began by explaining the course which would be pursued in the case of emergency. The Militia, he said, could be embodied in 15 days, and the Reserve in 48 hours, or four days at the outside, and, in addition, there would be the Yeomanry and the Volunteers. The protection of the commercial ports and coaling stations at home and abroad would be effected with submarine mines, and it would be possible to provide all the ports with submarine mines within 10 days, and in some cases within three days. For garrison work at home 124,000 men of the Reserve Forces were available, and as regarded the defence of the metropolis the River Thames would in future be placed under one commanding officer instead of being divided, as heretofore, into several districts. The mobilisation of 80,000 Regular troops could be effected at very short notice, and a large proportion of the infantry Volunteers not engaged in local defence would also be available, as well as 67 batteries of Volunteer Artillery with 238 guns. As regarded the defence of London the military officers whom he had consulted unanimously agreed upon the scheme to be adopted. Certain strategical positions would be prepared and strengthened at an expense of 20,000*l.*, but the permanent fortification of London had been abandoned as extravagant, visionary, and unnecessary. Turning to the Royal Artillery, he explained the new scheme of organisation which had been effected, and stated that 45 batteries would shortly be provided with the new 12-pounder gun, together with an adequate ammunition column and an efficient

reserve of drivers. Adverting next to the Ordnance Department, he said the manufacture of guns had received careful attention with a view of construction with greater rapidity; and, in addition to the Government factories, four large firms were now engaged in making steel forgings and three firms in building the guns, and during the coming financial year the turn-out would amount to 28 big guns for land and sea service during the first quarter, 32 guns during the second quarter, and 24 guns in the third quarter. The armaments at the naval ports and the coal-ing stations had also been largely increased, and during the year no less than two-and-a-quarter millions sterling had been spent, although, he said, considerable economy had been effected by concentrating the various ordnance departments under one head. He next discussed the necessity of efficient barrack accommodation, remarking that much was required to be done in this connection, for which, he said, it was the intention of the Government to ask for a special vote later in the Session; and, in conclusion, he gave an assurance that the Government would take every step necessary to maintain the defence of the country.

In the course of the usual discursive conversation which followed, Lord Wolmer (*Petersfield, Hants*) advocated numerous reforms in regard to the organisation and training of the Militia, urging the appointment of a committee of inquiry; and Lord R. Churchill, congratulating Mr. Stanhope on his statement, asked for further information as to the forces available for foreign service and India in case of emergency, and the ordnance resources of the country, and laid stress upon the importance of improved and increased barrack accommodation.

Sir George Trevelyan (*Bridgetown, Glasgow*) commented on the general organisation of the army, which, he maintained, was on false lines, and insisted that it should be based on a frank recognition of the fact that we could no longer take part in military operations on the Continent. He especially complained of the number of unemployed general officers, contending that rank should only accompany definite duty, and, protesting against the present system of promotion, he urged that appointments should not be made unless they were absolutely necessary.

Mr. Picton (*Leicester*), representing the advanced Radicals, moved the reduction of the vote by 2,615 men, the numbers proposed to be added to the effective strength of the army, and the debate was prolonged to a second day (March 12), when Sir E. Hamley (*Birkenhead*), in moving Mr. Picton's amendment, reverted to the Secretary of War's scheme for the disposition of troops in the event of an invasion. He regretted that Mr. Stanhope's statement had not been more explicit, and emphasised the necessity of arrangements being made for the concentration of as large a force of regular troops as possible at the point where the enemy would disembark. He also regretted

that the Secretary of State had not asked for a loan for still further employing our military resources, believing that the present was an especially opportune time for asking the country to provide funds for national defence.

Sir H. Havelock-Allan (*Durham, S.E.*) heartily concurred in the proposals of the Secretary of State, but hoped that his scheme of national defence would be made even more effective next Session, especially in the direction of increasing the efficiency of the Militia and improving the organisation of the Volunteers and developing their military qualities.

Lord C. Beresford, on the ground of economy as well as efficiency, urged that the coaling stations should be garrisoned by marines; and Sir W. Lawson (*Cockermouth, Cumberland*), advocating a policy of non-intervention and international arbitration, contended that there was no necessity to increase the Estimates for defensive purposes.

Mr. E. Stanhope, in reply, criticised the various suggestions made during the debate, which he promised to consider; and after some remarks from Mr. Woodall (*Hanley*) and Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch*), Mr. W. H. Smith, on Mr. Labouchere rising to speak, moved the closure, which was carried on a division by 221 to 101, and a division being taken on the amendment, it was negatived by 230 to 92, after which another division was challenged on the vote for men. This was carried by 231 to 88, and after some remarks from Mr. Conybeare (*Camborne*) and Mr. Picton, the vote for money was agreed to without a division, and the remaining votes were postponed until after Easter, when they were passed without difficulty and with little debate, the most noteworthy event being the strong views expressed by the Secretary for War with regard to the idea of conscription which had been referred to by the Adjutant-General, Lord Wolseley, in his speeches at Birmingham and Oxford. Mr. Stanhope, on the vote for the War Office (June 21), said the opinion of the Government was that conscription had been the curse of foreign countries, and he hoped that it would never be introduced into Great Britain.

The Civil Service Estimates, on the other hand, were the subject of minute criticism, and the number of nights given up to their discussion, which was prolonged to the close of the Session, was far greater than in any previous year. The total sum asked for was 15,739,092*l.*, which was less by 2,298,638*l.* than the Estimates of the previous year. This large decrease arose from the fact that, under the Local Government Act of 1888, large sums of money which had hitherto appeared in the Estimates as "Grants in Aid" had been transferred to the new local authorities. These charges were estimated at 2,303,392*l.*, so that the actual cost of the public service as shown in the Estimates 1889-90 was only 4,754*l.* above that of the preceding year. The principal charges so transferred appeared under the

vote for the Local Government Board, reduced from 448,968*l.* to 160,823*l.*; the vote for Police (England and Wales), reduced from 1,515,572*l.* to 56,586*l.*; the total removal of the charge for Pauper Lunatics (England), 493,000*l.*; and of about 61,760*l.* miscellaneous charges. The chief, and indeed almost only, increase was on the Education Vote, for which 3,684,339*l.* was required, as compared with 3,576,077*l.*, the estimate of the previous year. The cash extra receipts and the proceeds of the sale of fee and other stamps amounted to 2,008,466*l.*, thereby reducing the net amount of the Civil Service Estimates to 13,730,626*l.*

Such was the expenditure for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to make provision in his Budget, and it was consequently not without reason that, some time before he unfolded his financial plans, he had taken the opportunity to warn the public that the present was no moment for expecting a remission or even a reduction of taxation, and that a "humdrum budget" only could be looked for. In many quarters it was anticipated that the necessity of imposing fresh burdens, in order to carry out the ambitious schemes of the Ministry, would bring it into disfavour with a large body of its more lukewarm supporters. The Opposition were keenly on the alert to take advantage of any such shifting of public opinion; and it was therefore with some curiosity that Mr. Goschen's budget was awaited.

This expectation was not unreasonably prolonged, and before the House separated for the Easter Recess the Chancellor of the Exchequer presented (April 15) his financial review of the previous, and his proposals for the current, year. In a speech which lasted over two hours and a half Mr. Goschen, lifting his subject out of the dry region of statistics, managed to invest his figures with a living interest, and to enchain the attention of his hearers by the lucidity of his arrangement and the force of his illustrations. He began his speech by the plaintive admission that twice had he seen a prospective surplus within his grasp, and twice had it eluded him. In 1888 his surplus had been destroyed by the demand for the relief of local taxation; this year it was wrecked by the demand for increased means of national defence. The worst of it was that before he had satisfied the first demand the second was upon him, the result being that while "the cormorants of local taxation" had their hands in one of his pockets the organisers of national defence had their hands in the other. He had a million and a half for local taxation, a million and a half for national defence annuity, and a million and a quarter for extra expenditure on the army and navy, or four millions and a quarter more in all to provide than he had to provide last year. He rejoiced, however, over the fact that the estimated expenditure for last year had not been reached by a million, and that the estimated revenue had been exceeded by a million and three quarters, which, with the margin he had allowed for, gave him a surplus of nearly 2,800,000*l.* He

also found matter for satisfaction in the fact that the supplementary estimates had been less than in any year since 1868-9. The expenditure for last year, estimated at 86,613,000*l.*, had only amounted to 85,672,000*l.*, and the revenue, estimated at 86,830,000*l.*, had actually realised 88,473,000*l.* He gave the details of account on each side, and in commenting on them accounted for a falling-off of 41,000*l.* in the receipts from the tobacco duty, by explaining that the public were now provided with a particular kind of tobacco which "smoked more slowly," so that the smoker was able to "enjoy himself for an equal time and get as much satisfaction out of his pipe at a less expense," and thus, though the revenue suffered, there was no diminution in the enjoyment of the consuming classes. When he came to deal with drink, he placed "the sober beverages in the place of honour." He admitted that there was a "dull uniformity in coffee," which "would not move," but cocoa he declared, on the authority of experts, had been "puffed into its present place by the energy of ambitious advertisers," and so had tea. In alcoholic liquors there had been a falling off, and, while other articles of consumption kept near the line of population, that was not the case with spirituous drinks. One curious feature of this traffic was that "when one class of the community rushed to the spirit-bottle, another rushed to the decanter of wine," and when the rush declined in the one case it also fell off in the other. But while the consumption of the heavier wines had fallen off from 17,000,000 to 13,000,000 gallons, that of the lighter wines had increased from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 gallons. The general falling-off in the consumption of spirituous drinks he sought to explain by the use of cigarettes immediately after dinner. The total revenue from articles of general consumption had risen from 41,314,000*l.* to 41,455,000*l.*, or only $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. in a year of improving trade and rising wages. Coming to direct taxation, including stamps, he pointed out that no fewer than 1,743 new public companies had been floated since May last, with a registered capital of 132,000,000*l.*, which gave him a "momentary pang of regret" that he had not taxed such enterprises more highly. The income-tax had realised 12,454,000*l.*, or, after making all necessary allowances, 2,020,000*l.* per penny imposed, which was the highest amount per penny that the tax had ever yielded. He altogether dissented from the notion that the income-tax was to be recklessly used, or was to be regarded as other than a great reserve, for it operated oppressively upon small and struggling tradesmen, clerks, and others in a similar position. He stoutly declared—though, amid some signs of disapproval from the Opposition—that instead of calling upon this long-suffering and uncomplaining class to meet an emergency, it was better service to the State to "increase the number of the sources of revenue." Noting the signs of disapprobation, he went on—"If some of your great sources of revenue are breaking

under you, and if you accept the doctrine that the income-tax is not to be used for every emergency, you must look about for new sources of supply." He added, amid some cheering, "We have pushed simplicity up to a point beyond which we cannot go without endangering the system on which our national finance rests." He next proceeded to deal with the National Debt, and showed that during the last two years he had reduced it by fifteen millions, 7,634,000*l.* of which had been paid off in the last twelve months. The result was that whereas the debt stood at 705,575,000*l.* on March 31, 1888, it was now only 698,425,000*l.*, and he was loudly cheered when he went on to say, "We have now turned the corner of another hundred millions, and it is eighty years since the debt stood below seven hundred millions."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer then went on to deal with the estimated revenue and expenditure of the current year, based on the maintenance of the existing taxation. These results, compared with the actual receipts of the previous year, may be thus tabulated:—

| Revenue | | | Expenditure | | |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Estimate 1888-90 | Exchequer Receipts 1888-89 | | Estimate 1888-90 | Exchequer Issues in 1888-89 |
| | £ | £ | | £ | £ |
| Customs . . | 20,050,000 | 20,067,000 | Consolidated Fund | | |
| Excise . . | 22,570,000 | 25,600,000 | Charges . . | 29,274,000 | 27,854,580 |
| Stamps . . | 11,780,000 | 12,270,000 | Army . . | 17,335,900 | 15,957,788 |
| Land Tax . . | 1,035,000 | 1,020,000 | Navy . . | 13,685,000 | 12,999,895 |
| House Duty . | 1,925,000 | 1,940,000 | Civil Services . | 15,739,092 | 17,872,986 |
| Property and | | | Customs and In- | | |
| Income Tax . | 12,550,000 | 12,700,000 | land Revenue . | 2,679,961 | 2,718,822 |
| Post Office . | 9,350,000 | 9,100,000 | Post Office . . | 5,452,553 | 5,667,849 |
| Telegraph Ser- | | | Telegraph Service. | 2,135,516 | 1,965,000 |
| vice . . | 2,230,000 | 2,080,000 | Packet Service . | 664,405 | 637,502 |
| Crown Lands . | 430,000 | 430,000 | | | |
| Interest on Pur- | | | | | |
| chase Money | | | | | |
| of Suez Canal | | | | | |
| Shares, Sardin- | | | | | |
| ian Loan, &c. | 280,000 | 240,957 | | | |
| Miscellaneous . | 2,850,000 | 3,024,855 | | | |
| Total . | 85,050,000 | 88,472,812 | Total . . | 86,966,827 | 85,673,872 |

These figures showed that in the current year there was a prospective deficit of 1,917,000*l.*, and Mr. Goschen next addressed himself to show how this deficiency, due to the Navy Annuity and the Army and Navy Estimates, might be met. In the first place, his last year's scheme for the reduction of debt supplied him with a million, which would be increased to 1,450,000*l.* next year, when half a million would be applied to the remission of debt. He announced that he would appropriate this year's million to cover the deficit, but he declined amid cheers to meet the

balance by the easy method of adding a halfpenny to the income-tax. A sum of 800,000*l.* he proposed to raise by a rearrangement in some small points of the death duties, placing an extra tax of 1 per cent. on the succession to all estates, whether of realty or personalty, of 10,000*l.* and upwards. He also proposed, and the effect of this was included in the estimated produce of 800,000*l.*, to meet the many cases of evasion of the death duties—as, for instance, where a father gave his property to his son, taking a life annuity in exchange; or where partners in a firm, or members of a family, placed their property in a pool, all of it to go to the ultimate survivor without any payment to the State, thus defrauding the National Exchequer. Such “colourable transactions” were to be taxed for the future in accordance with the ordinary rule under which the death duties were levied. Finally a sum of 350,000*l.* would be raised by lowering the specific gravity of beer, on which a duty of 6*s.* 3*d.* per thirty-six gallons was levied, from 1·057 to 1·055, and this would only involve an increased duty of one-fourteenth of a penny per gallon. These arrangements would give a total revenue of 86,150,000*l.*, against an expenditure of 85,966,000*l.*, which would leave him a margin of 183,000*l.*

The final balance-sheet of the current year (1889–90) would stand consequently thus:—

| Revenue | | Expenditure | |
|--|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | £ | | £ |
| Customs | 20,050,000 | Permanent Charge of | |
| Excise | 22,570,000 | Debt | 28,274,000 |
| Beer | 300,000 | Army | 17,335,900 |
| Stamps | 11,780,000 | Navy | 13,685,400 |
| Estate Duty | 800,000 | Civil Services . . . | 15,733,092 |
| Land Tax | 1,035,000 | Customs and Inland | |
| House Duty | 1,925,000 | Revenue | 2,679,961 |
| Property and Income | | Post Office | 5,452,553 |
| Tax | 12,550,000 | Telegraph Service . . | 2,135,516 |
| Post Office | 9,350,000 | Packet Service . . . | 664,405 |
| Telegraph Service . . | 2,230,000 | | |
| Crown Lands | 430,000 | / | |
| Interest, &c., of Purchase Money of Suez Canal Shares, Sardinian Loan, &c. . . . | 280,000 | | |
| Miscellaneous | 2,850,000 | | |
| Total | 86,150,000 | Total | 85,966,827 |

Estimated surplus of income over expenditure, 183,000*l.*

Promising that the question of light gold should be dealt with in a separate measure during the Session, Mr. Goschen concluded by a very effective summary of the effects of the three Budgets he had introduced, assuming for the moment that his new proposals would meet the approval of the House of Commons. Taking what he called his “misdeeds” first, he had diminished the Sinking Fund by a million and a half,—originally by two

millions, of which he now replaced half a million; he had increased the death duties on fortunes above 10,000*l.* by 1 per cent.; he had put the Succession duty up to the point at which the Probate duty now stood as an Imperial tax. He had imposed a duty on sparkling wines; he had put 300,000*l.* on beer; he had increased the Stamp duties by about half a million; and he had caught in the net of Transfer duties some foreign securities which were previously exempt. Such were his misdeeds. On the other hand, he had reduced the Tobacco duties by 600,000*l.*; he had reduced the Income-tax by four millions; he had given two and a half millions in relief of local taxation. He had provided two millions extra for National Defence. He had converted 530,000,000*l.* of Consols, securing an annual saving in interest of 1,400,000*l.* at once, and 2,800,000*l.* by-and-bye; and he had paid off more debt during his two financial years than, excepting on one occasion, had ever been paid off before in the same time.

In the desultory debate which ensued, Mr. Childers, limiting himself to an expression of regret that the duties on silver plate and currants had not been dealt with, regarded the new proposals as to the death duties most important. He did not, however, go back to the debates of 1885 on that subject, or discuss to what extent the fortunes of the two political parties were affected by what had taken place on that matter. But he urged that Mr. Goschen was now proposing a new duty, to which he gave the name of an estate duty. That fresh death duty was to be levied equally on all estates, real or personal, which were worth more than 10,000*l.* The introduction of such a proposal, Mr. Childers maintained, sounded the knell of differential death duties; because, if they proposed to add to the death duties by a tax which for the first time absolutely fell equally on real and personal property, it would be impossible in future to maintain the differential duties in other respects on those two classes of property. Without expressing any opinion on the details of the plan—of which they could not judge without seeing the Bill—he was bound to say that the admission which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made was worth five or six years of debate on that subject; and, so far, they had gained what they fought so hard for in the time of the late Government.

From the Ministerial side of the House there was some grumbling because beer was to be further taxed, the death duties were to be increased, the wheel and van tax had not been re-introduced, and because no proposal was made to give State compensation for animals slaughtered under the Contagious Diseases Act. On the whole, however, Mr. Goschen's third Budget was well received, and ultimately it passed without amendment or alteration. By the press and the public the Budget was received with similar satisfaction. It might have been a "Prosperity Budget" had the requirements of the public service and of the

times been normal; but, great as these requirements were, Mr. Goschen managed to meet them without any appreciable addition to taxation. By a somewhat strange irony, this generally welcome Budget failed to save the Government the seat at Rochester, where the polling took place (April 16) on the very day after Mr. Goschen had explained his intentions.

It is, however, necessary to revert to what had been taking place in Parliament in the intervals of the debates on the national expenditure and the ways and means of providing for it. In the House of Commons, from the very outset of the Session (Feb. 28), the Ministry were assailed with numerous questions respecting the expenditure incurred on account of the Parnell Commission. Mr. W. H. Smith assured the House, without apparently carrying conviction to the minds of the Opposition, that the total amount expended out of the temporary Commission vote on account of the Commission was 1,384*l.* No secret service money, he declared, had been or would be spent in connection with the Commission, or the charges and allegations made against certain members of the House; no person had on behalf of the Government intimated to the proprietors of the *Times* that their expenses might be recouped by a Parliamentary grant. He moreover strongly insisted that any charges which the Attorney-General had advanced against certain Irish members and others had been made in his capacity of counsel for the *Times*, and not as an officer of the Government. From the moment, however, that the Pigott forgeries had been unveiled before the Parnell Commission, the Irish Nationalist members, supported by the whole strength of the Opposition, renewed their efforts to fix upon the Government collusion with the managers of the *Times* newspaper. The unfortunate, but thoroughly professional, step taken by the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster), in accepting a brief for the *Times*, was the point of attack chosen by the Opposition. Night after night Ministers were made to undergo the most searching cross-examination, in which suggestions of unfair dealing with the Parnellite witnesses and counsel were contrasted with the facilities and assistance accorded to those concerned in getting up the counter-case. To most of the charges brought against them the Ministers, out of deference to the proceedings of the sitting Commission, were unable to make replies which satisfied their opponents. At length an opportunity was found in Committee of Supply, from which it was necessary to obtain a vote on account for the various departments of the Civil Service. Three separate attacks were, in accordance with Sir William Harcourt's dictum at Lambeth, to be made under the most favourable conditions, and it was arranged beforehand that three days should be devoted to the "serious charges" which the Opposition decided to bring against the Government. There was, however, on the first day (March 20), some slight reluctance on the part of the assailants; but at length Sir William Harcourt (*Derby*) led off

an attack on the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews). He began by requiring fuller information with regard to Mr. Matthews's relations with prison and police administration, and the contradictory attitude assumed by him and the Chief Secretary for Ireland with regard to a letter on Irish prison discipline written by Dr. Barr. He then attacked the Home Secretary in reference to Pigott's visit to the convict Daly; but here the Attorney-General jumped up to explain that, so far from Pigott having visited Daly on behalf of the *Times*, or at the instigation of Mr. Soames, the *Times*' solicitor, Mr. Soames did not even know that the visit was made, gave no authority for it, and had nothing whatever to do with it. Sir W. Harcourt next censured the Home Secretary because Mr. Robert Anderson had been allowed to hand over confidential State documents to Major Le Caron. Fierce, however, as had been the attack, he wound up his speech without moving any amendment to the vote on account. Mr. Matthews (*Birmingham, East*) replied at once and with considerable vigour, making out a better case for himself than was expected, considering the weak points which had apparently been found in his armour during several previous nights of badgering cross-examination. He soon made it plain that the weak places were more apparent than real. There was a good deal of laughter and ironical cheering when he naively confessed that Dr. Barr's letter was published "under peculiar and special circumstances," but stated that he was aware after the letter had been published, and before he reprimanded its author, that Mr. Balfour had seen it, and he repudiated the "absolutely unfounded" notion that "one Cabinet Minister had encouraged the subordinate of another to break the rules of the service." As to the visit of Pigott to Daly, he showed conclusively that the *Times* had had nothing to do with it; and as to the facilities given to the *Times*' agents to visit other prisoners, he defended with considerable vigour and amid much cheering the right of the Government to enable what he described as "a State inquiry" to arrive at the truth. He also defended the action of Mr. Anderson in handing over documents to Major Le Caron, whose property in fact they were, since Major Le Caron himself wrote them. Sir William Harcourt then made a second speech, in which, with scant courtesy, he styled the explanations of Mr. Matthews a "cock-and-bull story," and spoke of Major Le Caron, Mr. Houston, Mr. Anderson, and the Marquess of Hartington as "private friends." This gave Mr. Balfour an opportunity to comment caustically on Sir William's "taste" before defending himself in reference to the letter of Dr. Barr. He declared that Dr. Barr was only attacked because he had made enemies of the Irish members, and had "exposed all the rubbish that had been talked about the treatment of so-called political prisoners." But the fact was that, "as soon as the Irish party marked out a victim, Sir William Harcourt came forward to execute the sentence." Mr. Healy (*Longford, N.*), in the

course of a characteristic speech, spoke of Pigott as "the pal and chum" of the Government, and then Mr. Bradlaugh moved a small reduction of the vote for the Home Secretary's salary. Later in the debate a heated controversy arose as to whether the Home Secretary should or should not read a letter from Pigott to the authorities, asking for permission to make a second visit to Daly. The right hon. gentleman was not inclined to read it, as its request was "not acceded to," and it had "nothing to do with the matter under discussion;" but the Opposition so persistently pressed for it, under the impression, apparently, that it would reveal some dark and terrible conspiracy, that at last Mr. Matthews read it out, and showed beyond all doubt that there was nothing at all of the slightest importance in it. Finally, Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment was negatived without a division, and progress was reported, the proceedings of the sitting having been of an unusually stormy character.

On the following day (March 21), the excitement showed no signs of abatement, and the House was once more crowded in every part. Considerable interest was shown at question-time as to the antecedents of Captain Segrave, one of the Irish resident magistrates whose conduct has given most offence to the Nationalist party, and who has therefore been singled out as a special object of Parliamentary attack. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (*Bristol, W.*), who had been Chief Secretary when Captain Segrave was appointed to the Irish magistracy, declared, in answer to questions, that he was solely responsible for the appointment, but he explained that the Captain was supported by excellent testimonials. Here the matter rested for awhile, but presently the House was put into a highly explosive state by the admission of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies that a communication had been received from the Government of the Cape Colony declaring that Captain Segrave, before he became an Irish magistrate, had been dismissed from the colonial forces for "gross neglect and breach of trust." The reading of this communication provoked tremendous cheering from the Irish party, and there were deafening shouts of "Mitchelstown—remember Mitchelstown!" which the Speaker had some difficulty in restraining.

Sir William Harcourt asked whether, now that Captain Segrave's antecedents were known to the Government, it was intended to ask the House to vote that gentleman's salary as a resident magistrate; but Mr. Balfour replied, "The right hon. gentleman need be under no alarm. As soon as I received the information I, of course, at once telegraphed over to Dublin, and Mr. Segrave is suspended." Mr. Sexton wanted to know why he had not been instantly dismissed, but the Chief Secretary naturally pointed out that it was necessary to wait for undoubted proofs of his guilt, and that in the meanwhile he would not perform any magisterial duty nor receive any pay. When the

debate on the vote on account was resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. John Morley (*Newcastle*) opened the second charge in the Opposition indictment and attacked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, explaining why it was that the Opposition declined the invitation of the Government to move a vote of censure. The reason was that "every day the Opposition were discovering some new fact, and it would be most irrational to propose a vote of censure, which would come in good time, until they had complete materials for their case." Mr. Morley was very angry indeed with Lord Salisbury for having suggested a doubt as to whether the famous *Times* letters were really forgeries after all, and then Mr. Morley went on to formulate his indictment, his chief charges being that the Government had allowed the Irish constabulary to assist in getting up evidence for the *Times*; that they had permitted a *Times* agent to administer an illegal oath in prison to Delaney, the convict, and that they had allowed Irish resident magistrates to remain in London for weeks and months actively engaged in helping the *Times* instead of returning to their own proper business in Ireland. Mr. Balfour, in an exceedingly animated reply, contrasted Mr. Morley's modest demeanour and charges with the far different style and language of other members of the Opposition, especially Sir William Harcourt, who had not hesitated to assert, outside the House, that Houston was the accomplice of Pigott; that the *Times* was the accomplice of Houston; and that the Government was the accomplice of the *Times*—all of which amounted, in Mr. Balfour's opinion, to a "shocking, scandalous, and unfounded charge." He accused the Opposition of preaching that no crime was so shocking as that of libelling political opponents, while in their practice they "fairly revelled in libel" themselves, and "libel was their daily bread." He showed that Houston, though he asked to be cross-examined as to whether there was a conspiracy between himself and Pigott, had never had his request granted; that there had been no attempt to shake Le Caron's important evidence; and that the Irish members had taken no steps to watch or to arrest Pigott after his own admission that he was "a forger and a liar." The Government, Mr. Balfour contended, had throughout maintained the strictest impartiality between all the parties concerned, and he indignantly denied that there was "a particle or tittle of evidence" to support the "loose accusations" so freely scattered abroad by Sir William Harcourt. Finally, Mr. Balfour frankly admitted, amid great cheering, that he would do everything in his power to aid the inquiry now going on before the Commission, whether that aid were given through Mr. Soames, or the *Times*, or through Mr. George Lewis, or whether it was given direct to the Commission at the request of the Commissioners themselves. Sir William Harcourt followed, but showed no disposition to repeat the extravagant charges he had made outside the House of Commons, and Sir John Gorst

(*Chatham*) taunted that right hon. gentleman with the exceeding difference between his outdoor belligerency and his indoor meekness. Mr. Bradlaugh then moved the reduction of Mr. Balfour's salary by 500*l.*, and the debate was carried on for several hours on the lines already laid down. At one point in it Mr. Healy had to be called to order for describing Mr. Justice Smith, one of the Commissioners, as "the chief ally of the *Times* on the bench." A like fate befell Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) for accusing Mr. Balfour and the Prime Minister of "trying to galvanise the forgeries into life." After resisting almost to the verge of being formally "named," he was compelled at last to withdraw the charge as it affected Mr. Balfour, though the accident that Lord Salisbury had no seat in the Lower Chamber enabled the hon. member successfully to evade withdrawal in the case of the Prime Minister—a point which raised a very nice question of political ethics. Finally the division was taken, and Mr. Bradlaugh's attempt to reduce the Chief Secretary's salary was defeated by 275 to 211 votes.

On the third night, devoted to the discussion of the vote on account, the interest shown in the proceedings of the House was even greater than it had been before, for the Opposition attack upon the Government was to culminate in a grand assault, led by the bitterest opponent of the Ministry out of doors, upon the Attorney-General. As the Government had sustained no particular damage by the previous trials of strength, there was a general impression that Friday's attack would be much more fierce. At question-time there was a repetition of the process of Minister-baiting on various incidents arising out of the Commission; but nothing of any particular importance was elicited. The Irish members were once more indignant over the inquiry to be made into Mr. O'Brien's prison treatment, for Mr. Balfour now stated that it would be conducted by a police inspector, that no counsel would be engaged, and that Mr. O'Brien would not be present and would not be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses. When the House got into Committee of Supply and resumed the debate on the vote on account, Sir William Harcourt spent upwards of an hour and a half in making his onslaught upon Sir Richard Webster. He maintained that the private practice carried on by an Attorney-General must be subject to these limitations—that it must not be of a character which disabled the chief law officer from advising the Crown or the House of Commons, nor must it occupy so much time as practically to deprive the State of services to which it had a right. He maintained that Sir Richard Webster's connection with the Parnell inquiry had influenced and misled public opinion, and he wanted to know whether Sir Richard advised the Government at any time in reference to the Commission. The Attorney-General, by taking up the *Times* brief, disabled himself from prosecuting on behalf of the State any person who might in the course of

the inquiry be proved to be guilty, and Sir William asked whether the Government assented to the action of Sir Richard Webster in becoming counsel for the *Times*. As to the forged letters he asked a series of questions, and condemned the whole case in regard to them. He especially condemned the keeping back of the letter of Pigott, in which Pigott informed Mr. Soames that if he were placed in the witness-box he could not stand cross-examination and his evidence would be discredited. Finally, he attacked the apology made on behalf of the *Times*, for the publication of the forged letters as "mean, contemptible, and disgraceful," and as "the handiwork of some pettifogging and cozening knave." The Attorney-General on rising was hissed as well as cheered, and he spoke with considerable spirit and at times with vehemence. He sarcastically contrasted Sir William Harcourt's meek House-of-Commons style with his extravagant rhetoric and reckless charges out of doors, and especially resented Sir William's description of him, outside Parliament, as "a disgrace to the English Bar." He vigorously denied that he had acted as the representative of the Government before the Commission, and he protested against the way in which he had been treated in reference to Pigott, and especially for keeping Pigott to the last moment while he was "piling up prejudice" against Mr. Parnell. He declined to say whether he had advised the Government about the Commission, and indignantly denied that he had ever vouched for the authenticity of the forged letters, or that he was in any way cognisant of Pigott's visit to the convict Daly. He declared, as to Pigott's letter confessing himself to be a very bad witness, that that letter was shown to Sir Charles Russell five days before Pigott was placed in the witness-box, and that though he (the Attorney-General) wished it to be read then, Sir Charles himself requested that it should not be read. This statement created a tremendous sensation in the House, and was loudly cheered from the Ministerial benches. Sir Richard went on to deal with various other points which had been raised, and finally he avowed himself as the "pettifogging and cozening knave" who alone had written and was responsible for the *Times* apology. He defended that apology as one in which he had "gone to the extremity of his duty," and he maintained that if he had to make it again, it would be in the same terms. The debate was carried on for some hours, and in the course of it Mr. Labouchere challenged the Conservatives to say whether any of them now believed in the genuineness of the forged letters, and one or two of them by their nods and cries intimated that they did. This brought up Mr. Parnell, who imperiously challenged any man to dare to say, by word or nod or gesture, that he (Mr. Parnell) had written any of the letters, and this time the Ministerialists were absolutely silent and motionless, the result of the challenge being received with loud Opposition cheers. Later on Sir Henry James (*Bury*) defended

the Attorney-General with great vigour, but Mr. John Morley announced, on the other hand, that Sir Charles Russell had authorised him to say that he was in entire accord with the Opposition in their attack on the law officer of the Crown. Ultimately, on a division, a motion which had been made by Mr. W. Redmond (*Fermanagh, N.*) for the reduction of the Attorney-General's salary by 1,000*l.* was rejected by 286 votes to 206, and the vote on account, which had been debated for three nights, was then agreed to. In the division some of the leading lawyers on the Opposition side refused to vote, whilst others, like Mr. Cozens Hardy (*Norfolk, N.*), boldly voted against their party, and in accordance with professional feeling.

On the report stage the Opposition tried to re-open many of the points disposed of in the debates on the vote on account, but without much success. Mr. Sexton (*Belfast, W.*), however, at the close of the questions brought forward a "question of order." He pointed out that Sir Richard Webster had voted in the division on the motion for the reduction of his own salary, citing in support of his argument a dictum in Sir T. Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice." The Speaker, however, put the objection aside on the ground that the motion, though formally to reduce the Attorney-General's salary, was really one to raise the question of his conduct. Sir Charles Russell (*Hackney, S.*), however, was more successful in impugning the accuracy of Sir R. Webster's statement that he had handed Pigott's letter to Sir C. Russell five days before Pigott was placed in the witness-box. The shorthand notes from which Sir C. Russell freely quoted showed that this was an entire mistake, and he declared that, whilst holding that the Attorney-General's conduct of the case had been unfair for the defendants, he drew a wide distinction between that and any imputation of dishonour. Sir R. Webster (*Isle of Wight*), in reply, although maintaining the general accuracy of his own recollection, admitted that he had made a mistake as to the five days. He positively affirmed that he wished Pigott's letter (which, on reflection, he admitted had not been shown to Sir C. Russell) to have been read in Court days before Pigott was placed in the witness-box, and that it would have been so read but for the fact that Sir C. Russell had objected to the production of any of the Pigott correspondence until the writer was in the box. On the other hand, Mr. Asquith, (*Fifehire, E.*), who had been associated with Sir C. Russell in the case before the Commission, affirmed positively that the Pigott letter was never produced voluntarily, but in response to a demand made in cross-examination which could not be evaded. Up to trial time, said Mr. Asquith, the counsel for the defence "never had the ghost or the glimmer of a notion" that any such letter was in existence, and he must leave this issue "to the honest judgment of any fair-minded, impartial man." This declaration increased the general perplexity and made it difficult,

if not impossible, to arrive at the real truth. Sir William Harcourt was not slow in making the most of the incident, and especially of one of Sir R. Webster's observations, that Pigott's letter was, after all, a matter of slight importance. "It was now said," he went on, "that the forged letter was of little importance;" it was important enough on the moving of the second "reading of the Coercion Bill. It was now said that this matter was of little importance, but it was considered important enough at the previous sitting when the Attorney-General thought it worth his while to influence the judgment of the House with it." The Solicitor-General, Sir Edward Clarke (*Plymouth*), in defending his colleague, challenged Sir W. Harcourt to say whether he did or did not charge Sir R. Webster with dishonourable conduct. The only reply, however, he obtained was that Sir W. Harcourt, like Sir C. Russell, charged the Attorney-General with "the unfair conduct of a criminal prosecution." The debate was protracted for some time longer, Mr. Labouchere attacking Sir Horace Davey and the lawyers generally because they had not voted against the Attorney-General. At length, after the closure had been applied (142 to 75), the report of supply was agreed to by 143 to 76 votes.

There were a few minor matters occupying the attention of the House of Commons before Easter, which call for special notice. Only two of the standing committees—of which great things had been hoped in relieving the House of much labour in the discussion of details—were re-appointed, that on Law and Legal Procedure, of which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman was elected chairman, and that on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing) presided over by Mr. Osborne Morgan. Of the hundred and more Bills brought in by private members on the second night of the Session a very small fraction even reached a second reading, whilst of those that passed that ordeal a very few escaped the perils of a committee stage, or obtained the assent of the House of Lords.

A Bill to amend the Laws relating to the Treatment of Prisoners in Ireland, brought in (Feb. 22) by Mr. J. O'Connor (*Kerry, S.*), gave rise to a prolonged and interesting debate on the second reading (March 13). It was warmly seconded by Sir W. Harcourt, but Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) moved, as an amendment, that it was inexpedient to proceed with a measure which proposed to modify the prison treatment of one class only of prisoners. The Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Government, proposed the middle course of an inquiry as to a possible modification of the existing prison rules. This proposal met with the support of the majority of the House, and the second reading of the bill was negatived by 259 to 193 votes. A question, however, arose as to whether Mr. T. W. Russell's amendment might not be put as a substantive motion; but ultimately both the amendment and the Bill were simultaneously withdrawn (April 15). Another brilliant skirmish took place over the Agricultural

Tenants (Ireland) Bill, brought in by Mr. Crilly (*Mayo, N.*), who, in moving the second reading (April 10), explained its object. He proposed, in order to protect tenants' improvements, to reduce the statutory term which for judicial rents had been fixed at fifteen years by Mr. Gladstone's Land Act to seven years, to empower the Land Courts to deal with the question of arrears, and to extend the benefits of the Land Act of 1887 to all leaseholders. Mr. Shaw Lefevre was the only member of the previous administration who spoke in favour of upsetting the law which Mr. Gladstone had framed, while the Solicitor-General for Ireland (Mr. Madden, *Dublin University*) opposed the Bill as an attempt to take away every reasonable and fair safeguard for the protection of the landlords. On a division an amendment to postpone the second reading for six months was agreed to by 229 to 168 votes, the Liberals generally voting in the minority.

The condition of the poor in large towns, although a matter of general interest, was scarcely within the range of practical politics, but an interesting though somewhat academic discussion on the subject was introduced by Mr. Broadhurst (*Nottingham, W.*), who having begun life as a journeyman stonemason, had risen to be Parliamentary Secretary of the Trades Unions, and Under-Secretary for the Home Department in Mr. Gladstone's last administration. In Committee of Supply (April 2) he moved that "the chronic poverty of great numbers of people living in the large cities and towns of Great Britain is a danger to the well-being of the State, and calls for the instant attention of the Government to remedial measures by which the depopulation of the agricultural districts may be checked and the congestion of the great centres of population relieved." He supported this thesis in a speech in which he denounced the rapid extension of the use of machinery in every branch of labour; adopted generally the Clerkenwell-Limehouse programme sketched out by Mr. John Morley; and recommended that every child should have free education, and "at least one hot, honest, wholesome meal a day," and that lodging-houses for the poor should be provided by the municipal authorities, as was done in Glasgow. Mr. Seton-Karr (*St. Helen's*) moved, as an alternative, that the State should aid in schemes of colonisation; and Mr. A. Acland (*Rotherham*) replied to both with some remarkable figures, which showed that there was a large emigration from London as well as immigration to it, and that the addition to its population from causes other than the excess of births over deaths was only ten thousand a year. London was, however, very full, and probably three hundred thousand of its people were in "a condition verging upon deep distress." Mr. Long (*Devizes*), Secretary to the Local Government Board, also replied, and, while avowing the deep sympathy of the Government with the condition of the poor, showed that pauperism had greatly declined. In 1870-71, it was in Manchester 56.2 per thousand, and in Bristol 70.1;

while in 1889, it was in Manchester 27·2, and in Bristol 53·7. Similar figures might be given for other large towns, and he did not believe that any cause was at work tending to increase pauperism. The debate was closed by Mr. Ritchie (*Tower Hamlets*), who promised on behalf of the Government that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the possibility of granting further facilities to emigration.

The question of the payment of members, introduced by Mr. Fenwick (*Wansbeck, Northumberland*), for many years a pitman at Bebside, although supported by Mr. John Morley, raised but little interest on either side of the House, which, after a languid debate (March 29), was counted out, only 29 members being present. More practical results, however, were obtained from a debate raised (March 29) by Mr. Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*), urging the Government to take the initiative in calling together a conference of the Powers to devise measures for the repression of the Slave Trade, and to give effect to the declarations contained in the Treaties of Vienna and Verona. The Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*), on behalf of the Government, replied that in September, 1888, Lord Salisbury had proposed to the Belgian Government to take the initiative in bringing together the Powers interested to deliberate upon united measures for the suppression of the Slave Trade. That proposal had been favourably received by the King of the Belgians; but, in the meantime, the unfortunate circumstances connected with the German expedition to the East Coast of Africa had for a time rendered the Conference inopportune. The Government, however, were ready to accede to the motion, subject to a slight verbal alteration. At a subsequent date (March 31) Sir J. Fergusson was able to state there was little doubt that the Conference would assemble.

From the outset of the Session, however, it had been assumed and recognised that the legislative business should be for the most part Scotch; and, in accordance perhaps with this idea, the Hon. A. Elliot (*Roxburghshire*) introduced (Feb. 22) a Bill for legalising in Scotland marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and Mr. Hunter (*Aberdeen, N.*) a Bill for assimilating the law of divorce in England and Scotland (Feb. 22). Although the former passed its second reading by a large majority (April 3), neither measure was ultimately proceeded with. The real interest of the Scotch members, therefore, was centred in the series of measures, four in number, which made up the scheme proposed by the Government for the establishment of a complete system of local government in Scotland. The Lord Advocate, Right Hon. J. H. A. Macdonald (*Edinburgh University*), in moving (April 8) for leave to bring in the Bills, gave a short sketch of their general scope and aim. Premising that any scheme of local government for Scotland must be distinctively Scotch, based on popular representation, fitted for the whole of Scotland,

comprehensive, and at the same time of such reasonable dimensions as to insure its passage through Parliament, he plunged at once into his mass of details. Many of the details of the measure, as will be shown, were subsequently modified in Committee, but the leading features of the Bill as originally introduced may be briefly summarised. The Royal and Parliamentary burghs of Scotland and the police burghs would be left untouched where they had a population of over 7,000; all with a less population would be merged in the counties, the larger burghs retaining their independence and autonomy. County councils were to be created to take over the powers hitherto exercised by the commissioners of supply, the road trustees, the "local authorities" for administering the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, and some of the administrative powers of the justices of the peace. The sheriff was left responsible for the administration of the peace and the maintenance of order with all his judicial powers. The chairman of each county council would take the ancient title of "convener of the county," and there were to be no separate members of the councils for owners or occupiers, but all were to be elected by the same constituency, there being no aldermen introduced. In the first councils the existing convener of the county, chairman of the road trustees, chairman of the "local authority," and Lord-Lieutenant would have seats, not as a check upon the power of the councils, but simply because these officials were the depositaries of an immense amount of experience in county affairs, which would be useful in the initiation of a new system. Every qualified ratepayer, including women and peers, would have a vote for the county councillors, and every holder of a service franchise choosing to pay the county rate, so that the constituency would be completely popular. Licences, as in England, would not be dealt with by the county councils. The rates hitherto paid by property owners would continue to be paid by them alone; but any excess over the average of such rates for the past five years would be equally divided between the owners and occupiers. All works involving capital expenditure and the borrowing of money would require the consent of a standing joint committee, to consist of seven county councillors and seven commissioners of supply, with the sheriff of the county as chairman, and the same joint committee would be the police committee for the management of the police under the new administration. Each county council would divide its county into districts, and for the management of all the roads a district committee would be appointed consisting of all the members of the council for the electoral divisions contained in the district, together with two members to be elected by each parochial board in the district. The district committees would exercise the powers given by the Public Health Acts, and would become the statutory "local authorities," appointing their own sanitary inspectors and having the assistance of the medical

officer of health, who was to be appointed by the county council. Each county council would be empowered to act in concert with adjoining county councils in matters of common concern, so as to insure economy and strength of administration. The elections of county councillors would be triennial, and the Secretary for Scotland was to determine the number of members for each council.

A boundary commission would be appointed to settle boundaries, and the electoral divisions would be drawn by the sheriff. The only qualification for a councillor was that he should be upon the county roll. The elections were to take place as part of the municipal elections, to avoid a multiplicity of elections and to save expense. Each council was to prepare an annual budget, which would be properly audited and published, and the power of surcharge would be given to the auditors. The existing county officials were to be taken over or superannuated by the councils, but all future appointments would be made by the councils themselves. Grants in aid hitherto given by the State to the amount of 356,000*l.* a year, for roads, police, medical relief, pauper lunatics, &c., were to be abandoned, but the State would surrender to the counties probate duty and licence duty to the amount of 557,000*l.* Of the surplus of 201,000*l.*, a sum of 80,000*l.* was to be applied to the Highland crofters, and the remainder, amounting to 171,000*l.*, through the Education Department to the payment of school fees in board schools and voluntary schools. The parochial boards were to be reformed, and the number of members on each board would be determined by the Board of Supervision, half being elected by owners and half by occupiers. The parochial board elections were to take place at the same time as the county council elections. For the future, private Bill legislation for Scotland was to remain as at present with Parliament, but the duty of ascertaining the facts in regard to each measure was not to be performed by a Parliamentary Select Committee, but by a roving commission, to consist of a Scotch Judge and two men versed in affairs, who would visit the various localities concerned, and ascertain the facts, the county councils having the right to appear before them, and their report presented to Parliament would serve as the usual committee stage upon private Bills.

After a desultory consideration, in the course of which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) expressed his regret that the control of the police and the question of licensing were not to be transferred to the county councils, the Bill was brought in and read a first time without a division.

On the following day (April 9) Dr. Clark (*Caitness-shire*), as a counterblast to the Ministerial scheme, moved a resolution in favour of giving to the people of Scotland, by their representatives in a national Parliament, the management and control of Scottish affairs. This proposal met with very scanty support, even from the

Scotch Liberals, Mr. Gladstone declining to support an abstract resolution which there was no prospect of carrying into effect. After a somewhat vague debate, Dr. Cameron (*Glasgow College*) moved the closure, which was agreed to, and the resolution was negatived by 200 to 79 votes.

The most important of the private Bills was one brought in (Feb. 22) by Mr. Cozens Hardy, Q.C. (*Norfolk, N.*), dealing with the investment of trust funds, and making it lawful for trustees, unless specifically forbidden by the instrument creating the trust, to invest in several securities other than those known as "Government securities." He proposed to include Metropolitan Board of Works stock, English and Irish railway debentures, or preference stock where dividends had been regularly paid on ordinary stock for ten consecutive years; the debentures, preference stock, fully paid-up shares of water companies which had regularly paid 5 per cent. on their ordinary stock or shares for ten years; guaranteed Indian railway securities, Municipal Corporations' stock, freehold ground rents, &c. The Bill further enabled trustees to purchase above par stocks redeemable at par. After a lengthy discussion (April 3), limited to lawyers, the Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee, where it was slightly altered and remodelled, but retained its essential features. It passed through its final stage (July 8) in the House of Commons after an amendment relating to investments in Corporation Water Companies, moved by Mr. Sexton (*Belfast, W.*), had been agreed to, whilst in the House of Lords it was further modified (July 29), but at length received Royal Assent at the close of the Session.

In the House of Lords the proceedings before Easter were even more than usually perfunctory; the increasing jealousy of the House of Commons rendering the initiation of business in the Upper House almost impossible and nearly always useless. The only debates of any consequence, therefore, arose out of subjects affecting only the Peers themselves. The Earl of Carnarvon, in moving the second reading (March 21) of his Bill to authorise the cancellation, discontinuance, and re-issue in particular cases of writs of summonses to the House of Lords, was met by a strong opposition from all sides of the House, and very little support from even the most advanced reformers. Lord Carnarvon, in support of his views, cited the famous cases of Lord Bacon and the Earl of Macclesfield, where the House, in addition to fining the peers for misconduct, resolved to disqualify them from ever sitting in Parliament again; but he pointed out that such a resolution, according to so great a constitutional authority as Lord Clarendon, was *ultra vires*, and in the next case he quoted—that of George Neville, Duke of Bedford, in the time of Edward IV.—it was determined to inflict the incapacity by Bill. The duke's offence was that he was disabled by his poverty, as he "had not a livelihood to support

his name, state, and dignity," in consequence of which it was enacted "that the making of the said duke be hereafter void and of no effect." In another case the Irish Parliament disabled by Bill Lord Strangford for having accepted a bribe. Under these circumstances Lord Carnarvon also proposed to proceed by Bill rather than by resolution. The Earl of Fife moved the rejection of the Bill on the ground that it was inexpedient to proceed with a measure affecting the privileges of members of the House which did not deal with the question of the amendment of its constitution. The real solution of the difficulty lay in adopting a system of delegation under which "black sheep" as a matter of course would not be elected, nor would those who rarely attended the House, or young peers fresh from college. Earl Cowper seconded the amendment; for, though he was in favour of any reasonable reform, he thought this particular measure would be difficult to work; and yet it would have to be put in practice at once, for, it passed, they could not afford to allow it to remain a dead letter. Lord Fitzgerald supported the Bill, but Lord Esher thought it "strange and impracticable." Viscount Midleton was in its favour, and the Earl of Derby was, like Lord Fife, disinclined to open up by so small a measure the whole question of the character and constitution of the House of Lords in the House of Commons, where it was not likely to meet with particularly friendly criticism. He did not think the Bill would succeed in any appreciable degree in excluding peers of disreputable character from the House, for it would not cover many cases that should be dealt with, and would cover many cases that should not be dealt with. A noble lord might be proved guilty of a misdemeanour if he omitted to repair a road or allowed his chimney to be a nuisance. Lord Salisbury agreed with Lord Derby that it would be better not to proceed with the Bill. He had asked over and over again for a list of "black sheep," but had never got it, and he confessed that he was growing sceptical as to its existence. He denied that there were any black sheep among those peers who regularly attended the House and transacted its business. Still, he thought that the peers, like the Commons, should have the power of expelling members, subject also, like the Commons, to the power of the authority which formed the House to send them back again—the Crown in the one case taking the place of the constituency in the other. It was undesirable to subject the constitution of the Upper House to "the dissecting light" of the Lower, for the House of Commons had "blunt methods of their own which might interfere with the good feeling between the two Chambers." Lord Herschell greatly doubted whether the Lords, like the Commons, did not possess the power of expulsion—a power resting on no statute, but inherent in the assembly. The Earl of Rosebery taunted noble lords on both sides for the general perplexity which appeared to prevail, and in which he confessed

that he shared himself. The whole difficulty, he thought, lay in the fact that the House was composed of an hereditary legislative caste, which made it a "painful truth" that a person of very indifferent character, who was popularly elected, had a safer position than a person of unimpeachable character who went into a legislative chamber by hereditary descent. Earl Granville also threw cold water on the measure in a brief speech, and ultimately Lord Salisbury moved the previous question, which was carried by 73 votes to 14, the Bill thus being got rid of without a formal rejection.

A somewhat curious instance of the difficulty of managing an excessive majority was shown a few days later when Lord Salisbury proposed Lord Balfour of Burleigh as Chairman of Committees in place of the Duke of Buckingham, stating that, deep as was his respect for the Earl of Morley, whom Lord Granville was about to propose, Lord Balfour of Burleigh had shown such ability in managing temporarily the business in Committee, and in conducting last year the Local Government Bill through the House of Lords, that he thought him eminently fit to be Chairman of Committees. Especially in relation to the Scotch Local Government Bill, he thought that Lord Balfour's Scotch experience would be of the utmost value. Lord Granville, in proposing his candidate, who, being a Liberal Unionist, was not a supporter, whilst fully appreciating Lord Balfour's qualifications, said that Lord Morley had just the same superiority of claim over Lord Balfour which, four years ago, the Duke of Buckingham had over Lord Morley,—a much greater length of official experience. Lord Morley had been as many years in official life as Lord Balfour had been months; and on this ground the Duke of Abercorn (disavowing all disloyalty to Lord Salisbury, whose claim on him as a party leader he recognised, he said, with more and more willingness every day) seconded Lord Granville's proposal of Lord Morley. On a division, Lord Morley was elected by 95 votes against 77; the Conservative peers voting in the majority being almost as numerous as those in the minority.

Outside Westminster Palace as well as inside attention had for many weeks been concentrated upon the proceedings before the Parnell Commission, and excitement reached its highest pitch as the forgeries and perjuries of the *Times'* witness Pigott were exposed by Sir Charles Russell. As might have been anticipated, the dramatic breakdown of this important feature of the case aroused considerable sympathy for the Home Rule party, and also gave rise to wild threats of proving all manner of conspiracies, in Parliament or out of it, between the Government and the *Times*. Mr. Healy in Parliament (Feb. 27), and Sir William Harcourt at Derby on the following day, plainly announced their intention of proving the charge; but, in the end, no specific accusation was made against any individual Minister, and still less against the Cabinet as a body, although various members of

it were nightly subjected to severe cross-examination by the Opposition in order to obtain some admission of their guilt.

Lord Hartington was one of the few party leaders who refused to make any allusion to the sensation of the day, while the Commission was still sitting; and in his speech at Norwich (Feb. 28) maintained that while the true issue in Ireland was closely connected with that raised before the Commission, it was also quite separable. Lord Hartington especially contended that the offences for which Irish members had been sent to prison could not properly be called political, when they were really incitements to intimidation and social tyranny. "This system has no counterpart in other parts of the United Kingdom, though exclusive dealing is practised by other political organisations.

I defy any of our opponents to point to a single case out of Ireland where a deliberately organised attempt has been made to render the lives of political or social opponents intolerable to them. Nor can they point out a case where communication with their neighbours has been forbidden, where men have been prohibited from supplying them with the necessities of life and the means of pursuing their lawful industry." Mr. Morley, said Lord Hartington, had advised a policy of conciliation; but how was a policy of conciliation possible "at the expense of offending and innocent victims"? The only way to conciliate would be to let the Irish Judges be elected, and also instructed "to protect the strong, the violent, and the powerful, and to abandon to the mercy of their opponents those who are weak and unprotected."

Earl Spencer could scarcely be expected to be equally reticent at the dinner of the Eighty Club (March 8), given at Willis's Rooms, where the former Viceroy of Ireland and Mr. Parnell publicly shook hands amidst enthusiastic cheering. In his subsequent speech he congratulated Mr. Parnell on having been clearly vindicated from the vehement, bitter, and wicked attacks which had been made upon him. He also bore testimony to the forbearance, dignity, and patience, so worthy of a great leader, which Mr. Parnell had shown under the great wrong inflicted upon him. He pronounced it to be the duty of the Liberal party to see that full reparation was done to Mr. Parnell; to see also that all who had assisted in the attacks should be brought to book; and to see, further, how far the Government had been concerned in them, and whether they were not intimate allies and co-partners with the *Times*. The fact that Major Le Caron had given evidence and had produced documents belonging to the State suggested that there must have been the closest alliance between the Government and the *Times*. Earl Spencer went on to examine the present condition of Ireland, and he contended, in spite of the assurances of the Government to the contrary, that Ireland was in a highly unsatisfactory state, as was proved by the fact that nearly a fourth of the Irish members had been imprisoned under the Crimes Act. He severely criticised the

prison treatment of such men, as beyond the spirit of the law, and declared that such treatment was resented not only by the Irish people, but by the English people also. He complained, further, that the clergy of Ireland should have been attacked by the Government and imprisoned, and pointed out that when one of them had to be arrested or removed from one place to another, a whole army had to go forth, for the feelings of the masses of the people were so outraged by such proceedings that the Government were afraid of a rescue or a riot. He went on to speak of the group of the Unionist members for Irish constituencies as a "most miserable and despicable body." Lord Spencer admitted that he was not always a Home Ruler, but candidly confessed that he had changed his opinions, and that when, during his own Viceroyalty, he was able to watch the feelings of the Irish people, he gradually came to the conclusion that there was something exceedingly wrong in our policy.

Mr. Parnell, following Lord Spencer upon the same occasion, rejoiced over the fact that the noble earl had admitted that Ireland had earned for herself the right to self-government, and was capable of self-government. Mr. Parnell valued the opinion of such a man, deeply experienced in Irish affairs, far more than he "valued the judgment of a hundred mushrooms such as Balfour."

This semi-private reception of Mr. Parnell was followed a few days later by a great National Protest Meeting held at St. James's Hall (March 13), presided over by Mr. John Morley, a large and enthusiastic gathering called together to welcome Mr. Parnell and to arraign the conduct of the Government for its complicity with the *Times*. After the meeting had passed by acclamation a series of resolutions condemning in vigorous language the Irish policy of the Government, Mr. Morley began his speech by announcing that he was the bearer of a message from Mr. Gladstone to declare that he foresaw the time rapidly approaching when the Opposition would "deliberately, cautiously, step by step, but surely, unfalteringly, and unflinchingly get to the bottom" of the proceedings which had been going on before the Special Commission. The ten resolutions which had been passed against the Government expressed, Mr. Morley declared, "the deliberate judgment, the deep feeling, and the stern, resolute, and deliberate purpose of a great party which had never yet taken up a cause without carrying it through." Home Rule must rest upon the foundation of mutual respect, good will, good understanding, good feeling, and good intention, and he rejoiced that the Liberal party had been the first to soothe Irish distrust, to extinguish British prejudice, and to grip Ireland with the right hand of fellowship. After more generalities in the same strain, Mr. Morley referred to the forged letters published by the *Times*, and ridiculed Lord Derby's description of them as a mere "personal incident." He was loudly cheered when he promised that, before many days were over, the House of Commons would be

called upon, if not by the Government, at all events by the Opposition, to declare that the *Times* had published "a false and malicious libel," and he urged that in publishing this libel at the time it did, with the avowed object of influencing the division on the second reading of the Coercion Bill, the *Times* was guilty of an aggravation of the offence, which even the present Parliament would be bound to notice and to punish. He censured the Government with much severity for the part they had taken in the business—for not preserving an "austere neutrality," but showing instead "the meanest, most virulent, and most vindictive partisanship," which led them to force through Parliament a Bill constituting a new tribunal of a very irregular kind, and to allow their chief legal adviser to act for months as counsel for the *Times*. He undertook that when the vote on account was proposed in Parliament, the conduct of the Attorney-General should be discussed, and he blamed the Government again for allowing the resources of the State—Crown solicitors, magistrates, constabulary, Government officials of every rank, and even State documents—to be placed at the service of one of the parties in this great suit. Mr. Morley proceeded to denounce the "Tories, Unionists, Primrose dames, and clubmen" who resisted Home Rule on the ground that they were "furious because the lie of the *Times* was not true—because the intriguers had been exposed and the perjurers and forgers found out." The controversy would now be made to turn on the question as to whether the people who had done these things hitherto were "fit to make laws for Ireland and to govern Ireland's destinies."

Mr. Parnell, who was received with tremendous enthusiasm, next addressed the meeting. He condemned the "petty and malignant measures" of Mr. Balfour's administration, and maintained that there must necessarily be "something rotten" in a system of government which compelled the ostracism from the affairs of the empire of 86 out of 103 Irish members. Those members were pledged to "accept no place or office for themselves or for others from any English Government, so long as the just rights of Ireland were not conceded," and any one of them who broke that pledge would not find a single constituency throughout the length and breadth of Ireland which would reelect him. Mr. Balfour could not govern Ireland for two years without putting four-and-twenty Irish members into gaol as common felons for offences unknown to the English law. Mr. Parnell promised to deal, both in the witness-box and in his place in the House of Commons, with the charges which the *Times* had brought against him and his associates, and he asked why, if there was any foundation for such charges, the Government did not institute a prosecution? His own answer was that at the time the charges were made Lord Carnarvon was actually engaged in inviting the Irish party to confer with him as to the formation of a new Constitution and an Irish Parliament, and

therefore it was that "the business of unearthing crime was left to amateurs who had made such a mess of it." No single matter substantiated by the *Times* was unknown to Lord Carnarvon and Lord Salisbury when they were negotiating with the Irish party, and that was the reason why the Government had since "fought from behind the petticoats of the *Times*," and "had recourse to every subterfuge and dodge." Mr. Parnell then dealt at considerable length with the Irish land question to prove what he styled "the unfortunate incapacity of the Imperial Parliament to do justice to Ireland." He condemned "violent and unconstitutional action" on the part of the Irish people (though he thought there was much to account for it), and he rejoiced over the fact that "Ireland had now definitely turned her back upon all these past hopeless and desperate courses, and was confident that in the ways of the Constitution lay her safety."

On the same day Sir William Harcourt at Ely repeated in somewhat similar terms the indictment against the Government, holding with Mr. Morley that the Unionists were not glad that the charges against the Irish Nationalists had been refuted, and concluded with the prophecy that "the claims of the Irish people would be considered on their merits, when all this evil-speaking, lying, and slandering was over."

Lord Hartington's simultaneous speech at Holloway Hall, West Islington, was the more important because Unionist leaders so seldom spoke in meetings in the London district, and also because he took the opportunity of retorting vigorously upon Mr. John Morley, who had challenged his right to criticise the "Clerkenwell-cum-Limehouse" programme of the Gladstonian party. He denied that a great statesman like Mr. Gladstone had any right to put forward a policy except one framed upon a mature and deliberate consideration of the wants of the nation, and not framed merely with a view to temporary party expediency or the necessity of gaining votes. Such a leader had no right, on account of the changes which had taken place in the composition of his party, to fundamentally alter in a Radical sense the policy which he formerly thought sufficient and necessary. In an eloquent passage, reminding one of a famous page in Macaulay's essays, Lord Hartington dwelt on the greatness and importance of England, and on the special need that London of all places should keep imperial considerations well in view, and he expressed satisfaction that an important part of the present Parliamentary Session was to be spent in strengthening the navy, and thus acknowledging our imperial responsibilities. Turning then to Home Rule, he argued that it involved, not a mere difference of opinion on Irish self-government, but the maintenance of the existing Constitution under which the greatness and prosperity of the empire had been built up, or the substitution of a new one, under which the law was not to be the law of Parliament, but the law of a faction which happened for the moment to be

the most powerful, the strongest, and the most violent. Lord Hartington next attacked the recent declaration of Lord Spencer that he (Lord Spencer) was converted to Home Rule by the result in Ireland of the General Election of 1885, when Mr. Parnell's following, instead of diminishing, greatly gained in strength. He pointed out that that result could have come upon nobody by surprise, and certainly not upon Earl Spencer, as everyone had foreseen it. When Lord Spencer spoke of the minority in Ireland as "mean and despicable," Lord Hartington replied by pointing out that it included the loyal and orderly population; the whole of the Liberal party as it formerly existed in Ireland; almost all the supporters in the north of Ireland of Mr. Gladstone's Church and land policy; all the 1,700,000 Protestants of Ireland with very few exceptions; all the most educated classes, leaders of industry, and commercial men; and the most energetic and prosperous part of the community. It was not statesmanship, but "absolute insanity," to ignore the opinion of such a minority or to irritate and offend it by calling it "mean and despicable." Lord Hartington then turned to Sir William Harcourt, and out of that right hon. gentleman's own mouth he proved him to have been the real author of "Parnellism and Crime," and provoked much laughter by quoting from a speech made by Sir William in the House of Commons in March, 1881, in which he declared the doctrine of the Land League to be "the doctrine of treason and assassination," and the League itself a "vile conspiracy," and in which he spoke of Mr. John Dillon as the "confederate" of John Devoy and Redpath, one of whom was "a convicted Fenian." These were not expressions of opinion which a politician was at liberty to change, for they were, if anything, statements of fact known to Sir William Harcourt in his official capacity, and which he had never since retracted or denied. All that the *Times* had done had been to repeat these statements in greater detail. As to the letters, Lord Hartington declared he had never expressed any opinion as to their authenticity, and when the proper time came to discuss the matter, it would be seen that the Unionist party had throughout acted in a spirit of perfect fairness and fairplay towards everyone connected either with the making or the subject of the charges.

A few days later Lord Salisbury himself descended into the arena, and, taking advantage of the opening of a Conservative Club at Watford (March 19), he repudiated with great warmth the charge that the Government had any interest in supporting the *Times* against Mr. Parnell; but, out of respect for the Commission, he proposed to observe a fitting silence on subjects still *sub judice*. "By some strange hallucination it is supposed that we have some special interest in those equivocal documents, and that it was our doing to select them as the test upon which the merits of the Irish leaders should be judged. I beg to assure you that the truth is exactly the reverse. I observe that the

fact that a Nationalist has forged the signature of the Nationalist leader is treated in certain circles as a remarkable testimony to the merits of the Nationalist leader, and that on public platforms a great process of public embracing has been going on, and that the men who were the most deadly opponents, and said the most atrocious things of each other, fall into each other's arms because it was proved that this Nationalist journalist had committed certain forgeries. Well, I desire to express no opinion, but I confess it seems to me that this jubilation is excessive and possibly premature, and I should like to wait before expressing an opinion on any portion of the subject till that competent tribunal to which I have referred has delivered its judgment. But only the fact that a man has forged your signature is not proof that you are possessed of every statesmanlike quality and every moral virtue. I have only missed one character in the *dramatis persone* in these various embracements of Mr. Parnell—I cannot help wishing that Sir William Harcourt had taken part, and I should have then known more exactly, perhaps, the meaning of that phrase, which has always remained somewhat dark and obscure in my mind, about 'stewing in Parnellite juice.' I am sorry to say that the effect upon Mr. Parnell's moral nature has been wholly deleterious. He was always rather given to a flighty imagination before; but his attempt to give an account of facts since he has had the backing of the Gladstonian party really rivals anything in the 'Arabian Nights,' or that Baron Münchhausen ever wrote." Lord Salisbury proceeded to comment on a few of Mr. Parnell's observations because, if he was to be looked upon as the *alter ego* of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Spencer, he became a much more important person. There was not the faintest foundation for the statement either that the Tory party, by the mouth of Lord Carnarvon, ever promised an Irish Parliament to Mr. Parnell, or that the Tory party ever brought forward forged letters as a proof of his criminality. It was also untrue that any Irish landlord had the power—or for the last nineteen years had ever had the power—of robbing a tenant of the value of his improvements. There was no country in Europe or America where the position of the tenant was so favourable as in Ireland. After noticing how deeply the country and the Ministry were indebted to Mr. Balfour, Lord Salisbury said that if a tenant were wronged there was a Parliament which had shown itself only too willing to do him justice. And it had been understood to be one of the advantages of democratic institutions that a democratic Parliament was to be obeyed by the Radicals who had voted it into existence. If the principle were once admitted that a statute passed by a democratic Parliament could be rightly and morally defied at the bidding of midnight conclaves and associations, civilisation would be undermined. With regard to Mr. W. O'Brien, Lord Salisbury would not enter into the question of his "tragic nudity;" but if one wanted prison rules altered, "there

were other ways of getting that done than by lying on your back and kicking at the warder." There was once an English sovereign who lost his throne because he tried to do what the Government were recommended to do—namely, to exercise a dispensing power and to make the Executive Government supreme over the decisions of the Courts of Justice. As long as there was an agrarian question, so long would there be a large number of people who would support Home Rule, without any real conviction of the benefits of separation from this country. If Mr. Balfour succeeded, the cry of Home Rule would be crushed. The most important thing, as soon as order was restored, was to increase the number of occupying owners in Ireland. Lord Ashbourne's Acts had had this object in view, but they might go much further with safety and profit. When once there was a large number of occupying owners in Ireland, the cry for Home Rule would disappear, and local self-government might be granted with perfect safety even in the most disturbed districts. As to bye-elections, they were no doubt matter for discussion and examination; but it was not very easy to ascertain from them what future general elections would be. "Nothing but a vote of want of confidence can procure the dissolution of Parliament. It therefore seems to me that those who count on obstruction or abuse, or any other weapons of that kind, for the purpose of procuring such a dissolution, are amusing themselves with a dream which will only disappoint them."

But this and similar speeches made in various parts of the country were unable to gain a single vote for the party in the House of Commons. At Barnsley, in contesting the vacancy caused by Mr. Kenny's resignation, although the Unionist candidate, Mr. Bruce Wentworth, polled upwards of 850 more votes than in 1886, and over a thousand more than in 1885, he was unable to wrest the seat from the Gladstonian candidate, Lord Compton, who was returned (March 11) by a majority of 2,452 votes. In Kennington the result was even more disastrous, for there the seat, carried by a Conservative with a majority of 430 in 1886, passed over to the Gladstonians by a majority of 630. In the case of Barnsley, the Unionists found some consolation in the steady increase of their numbers; but in Kennington, Mr. Mark Beaufoy's supporters had risen from 2,732 to 4,069, whilst the Conservative vote had remained practically stationary, allowance being made for a slight increase in population. A few weeks later (April 16), at Rochester, another seat was carried by the Gladstonian Liberals, when Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen was elected by 1,655 votes against 1,580 given to his Conservative opponent, Mr. Gent Davis, notwithstanding the well-known opposition of his father, Lord Brasenourne, to Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy. In 1886 the Conservatives had won the seat with a majority of 269 votes on a much smaller poll, so that defeat on the present occasion offered no element of consolation. On the

other hand, in the Enfield division of Middlesex, where a vacancy had arisen in consequence of the succession of Lord Folkestone to his father's peerage, the Conservative candidate, Captain Bowles, was returned by a majority of 1,512 over Mr. Fairbairns, the Gladstonian Liberal, the numbers being 5,124 to 3,612. The voters who went to the poll were very much more numerous than in 1885 when the Liberal party was still undivided, and Lord Folkestone was returned by a majority of 960, or in 1886 when there was a mere pretence at a contest, when the total voters only numbered 4,554.

If, however, the Opposition was slowly gaining recruits at the bye-elections, a new danger to its cohesion arose within the walls of Parliament. A new party, having for its recognised leader Mr. Labouchere, and duly equipped with "whips" and other emblems of distinct organisation, determined, if possible, to force on an early dissolution by means of "set debates" upon votes in supply. The assurance given by the leader of the House that the discussion of the Estimates should occupy a prominent place in the business of the Session gave the "Jacobyns"—as they were called after one of their whips, Mr. Jacoby (*Derbyshire, M.*)—a fine field for their campaign. Mr. Labouchere, in defending himself and his friends (March 19) from the charge of wasting time, declared that he regarded votes of want of confidence as "mistaken in tactics," that he and his friends "meant to carry on a guerilla warfare," and that "if the Chancellor of the Exchequer took up an attitude of defiance and refused to consult the country, then the Opposition would throw every obstacle they could in the way of the transaction of public business." Up to Easter, the action of the party was limited to impeding the work of supply—not altogether without good results, for numerous votes were reasonably attacked and suggestions thrown out, which, if acted upon, might lead to profitable results and to the better husbanding of the public purse.

The fatal termination of Mr. John Bright's prolonged illness had been fully anticipated; nevertheless, the feeling was universal that with him English politics lost one of its most characteristic leaders, and the news of his death caused many to realise in a fuller sense the unique position he had occupied during nearly a half century which he had devoted to the service of his country. He had begun political life as a member of the smallest party in the House of Commons; he had for years formed one of a minority whose objects were denounced as revolutionary; he had lived to see his party dominant in the country, the chief reforms for which he had laboured adopted; himself a Minister of the Crown, and finally a supporter of the party against which he had fought so valiantly and in the face of much obloquy and misrepresentation. Nevertheless, the universal judgment on Mr. Bright was that he had throughout his career been absolutely consistent. Parties had shifted, party cries had changed, and party politics

had varied with the necessities of the times; but Mr. Bright had never swerved from the programme which he had fixed for himself when entering public life. He had been foremost in obtaining the repeal of the Corn Laws and other restrictions on trade; he made possible the Reform Bill of 1867, which admitted the lower middle class to a share in the government of the country; he enabled Lord Stanley to transfer the government of India to the Crown; and he was the first to claim for the Irish labourers the right of proprietorship, and to urge the policy of increasing the number of freeholders in that country. Down to 1885 all Mr. Gladstone's liberal measures for the social and political advancement of the people of the United Kingdom had the support of his unrivalled oratory; but when he had seen the fulfilment of so much of his programme as seemed desirable, he refused to lend the weight of his name and influence to support demands which he believed unreal, and to endorse a policy which he regarded, if not as baneful, at least visionary.

In both Houses of Parliament tributes were paid to the memory of the deceased statesman. Lord Salisbury, in speaking of one who for years was known as "the tribune of the people," said that "he was the greatest master of English oratory that this generation—I may, perhaps, say several generations—has produced. I have met men who have heard Pitt and Fox, and in whose judgment their eloquence at its best was inferior to the finest efforts of John Bright. At a time when much speaking has depressed, has almost exterminated eloquence, he maintained that robust, powerful, and vigorous style in which he gave fitting expression to the burning and noble thoughts he desired to utter." Lord Granville bore special testimony to the services rendered by Mr. Bright to his colleagues in the Cabinet, where nothing was more remarkable than the moderation of his counsels and his services as a peacemaker. In the House of Commons Mr. W. H. Smith insisted upon Mr. Bright's simplicity and dislike of anything like adulation, and Mr. Gladstone described him as *felix opportunitate mortis*. All his principles had triumphed, and at the close of a long life he had even reconciled his foes to him without alienating his friends. Mr. Gladstone further dwelt on the wonderful moral elevation of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright in being able to dispense at a moment's notice with that breath of popular favour which they had enjoyed so long, and to stand firm against the voice of the nation when the Crimean war broke out and Lord Palmerston's policy commanded almost universal enthusiasm. "His name remains indelibly written in the annals of this Empire,—aye, indelibly written, too, upon the hearts of the great and ever-spreading race to which he belonged: that race in whose wide expansion he rejoiced, and whose power and pre-eminence he believed to be full of promise and full of glory for the best interests of mankind."

Lord Hartington remarked that Mr. Bright did not profess

to be a statesman, and in the sense of official training perhaps was not exactly a statesman; but that few men of equal power had ever applied so consistently to their public conduct the moral standard by which they regulated their private lives. This was the characteristic which had made Mr. Bright's memory so precious a possession to us, and which would make his example a guide to all who aspired to lead public opinion. Mr. Justin McCarthy, in the absence of Mr. Parnell, followed with a kindly tribute to Mr. Bright's early exertions in the cause of Ireland, which he said that the Irish would remember long after his recent differences with them had been forgotten; and then Mr. Chamberlain said a few grateful words on behalf of Birmingham, where discord was so soon to threaten the harmonious understanding which Mr. Bright had done his utmost to promote.

In 1885, when the Liberal party still presented an unbroken front, Lord Randolph Churchill had offered himself as the Conservative candidate for the newly-created division of West Birmingham. Although unsuccessful, he had polled 4,216 votes, against 4,989 given to Mr. John Bright, and, on taking leave of his supporters, the defeated candidate had promised to come forward again when a vacancy should occur. In 1886 the compact between the Liberal Unionists and the Conservatives stood in the way of any contest, and Mr. Bright was returned unopposed. It was also about this time that a more general understanding was arrived at between the two parties that Liberal Unionists and Conservatives should not, until at least the ensuing general election, oppose one another, but that they should mutually support each other's candidates according to the *nuance* of the vacancy occurring. This understanding had been hitherto observed on both sides; but on Mr. Bright's death it was urged by the Conservative Committee at Birmingham that Lord Randolph Churchill's specific promise was not overriden or set aside by the general agreement. The existence, however, of this special agreement was strenuously denied by the Liberal Unionists, who, after a moment's hesitation, fixed upon Mr. John Albert Bright as their candidate, and asked him to contest the seat his father had occupied. The Conservatives urged, with considerable show of reason, that the vote of 1885 proved how strong was their party, and that, with the loyal support of the Liberal Unionists, they would be able to hold the seat securely against any Gladstonian Liberal. On the other hand, the strength of the Liberal Unionists in the division had never been ascertained, and that consequently, if a representative of that section were elected, nearly one-half of the constituency would continue to be unrepresented, so far as their special Conservative opinions were concerned. To add to the complications of the situation, it subsequently transpired that when the news of Mr. Bright's serious condition was first made known (nearly twelve months before his death) the Liberal-Unionist Committee, through its chairman,

had agreed to support Lord R. Churchill, if the local Conservatives could obtain his promise to stand; but this promise, the Unionists declared, Lord Randolph on three occasions had declined to give, and in the previous November negotiations had been opened with Mr. J. A. Bright with the full knowledge of the local Conservatives. Nevertheless, on the day after the vacancy was declared, an article in the *Birmingham Daily Post* supported the candidature of Lord Randolph, and led the Conservatives to believe that he would be accepted by both parties. On being urged to present himself, Lord R. Churchill replied that, personally, he was willing to fight the seat for his party, but in view of the complicated situation he placed himself in the hands of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Lord Hartington, and Mr. Chamberlain. These councillors, after short, but probably sufficient deliberation, unanimously advised Lord R. Churchill to decline the invitation. The Birmingham Conservatives, indignant at what they regarded as the unfair pressure brought to bear upon their candidate, refused to co-operate with the Liberal Unionists, and for some days it seemed as if the Gladstonian candidate—Mr. Phipson Beale, Q.C.—might snatch the seat from the now estranged allies. The Cabinet, appreciating the dangers of the situation, despatched Mr. Balfour to act as peacemaker, and to prevent such an untoward catastrophe as was threatened. His representations prevailed, and after all Mr. J. A. Bright was returned by an unexpectedly large majority, 5,621 votes being given to him, whilst Mr. Phipson Beale, to the general surprise, only polled 2,561—so powerful was the prestige of Mr. Bright's name among the Birmingham electors.

Unfortunately, the matter was not allowed to drop, even when its agitation no longer served any other practical purpose than that of embittering relations between the two parties, and at caucus meetings and in the press the controversy was long sustained with undiminished acrimony. The leaders of the Radical Unionists produced letters to show that nothing in the nature of a regular agreement existed between them and the Conservatives on the subject of Mr. Bright's seat. They asserted, on the contrary, that they had always looked upon the seat as one to which they were entitled, and had explained this to the Conservative Committee, at the same time offering to accept Lord R. Churchill if he consented to come forward. Lord R. Churchill, however, having declined to do so, they felt free to run their own candidate.

In reply, Sir James Sawyer, on behalf of the Grand Council of the Birmingham Conservative Association, maintained that there was a definite compact with the Liberal Unionists that on the first vacancy in the representation of Central Birmingham Lord R. Churchill should be the candidate of both parties; and Mr. Rowlands, another leading Conservative, asserted that Lord R. Churchill had signified his readiness to come forward if he

received the support of the Unionist party. In presence of this absolute d.urgence of recollection, or fact, Mr. J. Chamberlain felt it necessary to intervene by a letter addressed to the *Birmingham Daily Post*, and also to the *Daily Gazette*. After explaining that his delay in answering the allegation of the Conservatives had arisen from his desire not to imperil the safety of the Unionist seat, he went on to say:—"As the Conservatives, in their desire to justify themselves, have flung charges of treachery, intrigue, and breach of faith against the Liberal Unionists, we must now insist that they must publicly state the facts on which they rest their accusations, and especially that they shall say distinctly what were the exact terms of the compact which they assert, when it was made and by whom, and in what respect, and by what act of ours, they contend it was broken."

The true facts of the case, so far as they were known to the Liberal Unionists, were then stated by Mr. Chamberlain. He denied that there was an understanding of any kind that the vacant seat in Central Birmingham should be given to Lord Randolph Churchill, adding that the Liberal Unionists felt that if the local Conservatives were determined at all hazards to run Lord Randolph Churchill, the candidature of a Liberal Unionist would probably cause the loss of the seat, and they decided, therefore, in the interests of the Union, to make a virtue of a necessity and to do their best to secure the support of the Liberal-Unionist party for him. In November previous, Mr. Powell Williams and Mr. William Kenrick separately saw Lord Randolph Churchill, and learned from himself that he did not propose to stand for Central Birmingham, and in a subsequent conversation with Lord Hartington and an influential Conservative official, Lord Randolph Churchill further explained his position, and stated his unwillingness to give up his present constituency unless the paramount interest of the Unionist cause required him to make the sacrifice. It was only after receiving this information that Mr. A. Bright was communicated with, and Mr. Rowlands, who was immediately made aware of the communication and its results, made no complaint whatever, and no reference to any alleged compact. On the 26th of March Lord Randolph Churchill repeated to him (Mr. Chamberlain) his refusal to stand. In conclusion, Mr. Chamberlain denied that there was any intrigue of any kind to prevent Lord Randolph Churchill from standing; on the contrary he expressed his readiness to do all in his power to promote his return if he should finally decide to come forward.

Mr. Powell Williams, M.P., Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, and Alderman Johnson, chairman of the Liberal Unionist Association for the division, also addressed letters to the two papers named, similarly repudiating any part in, or knowledge of, such a compact as the Conservative leaders alleged to have been made. Mr. Powell Williams wrote: "I was a party to no under-

standing save this—that if the local Conservative leaders succeeded in inducing Lord Randolph Churchill to stand, the Liberal Unionists would not oppose him so far as I had any authority to speak for them. It was for the Conservatives to secure him; and Mr. Rowlands was in error in saying that I consented on Monday (April 2) to accompany the deputation that waited upon him. On the contrary, I declined to do so, as Mr. Baily, who was present, can testify.”

To the statement that in the previous November he had already announced his intention not to come forward, Lord Randolph Churchill telegraphed at once a distinct denial, and on the following day he wrote to Mr. Chamberlain, simultaneously forwarding it to both newspapers, a letter, of which the following were the leading passages:—

“In my letter to you of the 30th May, 1888, a reply to one inquiring whether I meant to come forward for Birmingham in the event of a vacancy occurring in the Central Division, I wrote as follows:—‘I hope Mr. Bright will get better; the news this morning is more favourable. In the event of a vacancy occurring, I should not leave Paddington unless it was the strong, unanimous wish of the Tories and of your party combined, and unless they were of opinion that there was real danger of the seat being lost if I did not stand. I do not imagine, however, that these two conditions are likely to arise. The seat is a Liberal-Unionist seat, and that party has a right to put forward one of their own candidates, and to receive a full measure of Tory support.’”

These conditions, Lord Randolph Churchill argued, did arise in a very definite manner, and when the writ was moved for (April 2) he had reason to suppose that complete unanimity prevailed, and that his election was secure. In refutation of the subsequent suggestion of the insecurity of the seat, he referred to the appeal of Mr. Balfour (an interposition by a Cabinet Minister without precedent in electoral history), without which the Conservative party would not have supported Mr. J. A. Bright. Lord Randolph Churchill then proceeded to discuss the change which had come over Birmingham local politics since the beginning of the late Mr. Bright's illness, in the previous year.

“Since the 30th May the position as described in my letter of that date was substantially modified. It was decided by yourself and your friends last summer to enter into much closer relations with the Conservatives in Birmingham for the purpose of gaining larger Unionist representation on the Birmingham City Council. During the negotiations which thereupon took place, your friends, if not you personally, allowed the Conservatives to understand that their Parliamentary representation was, in your opinion, inadequate in proportion to their numbers, and, if opportunity arose, it should be attempted to modify this state of things to the advantage of the Conservatives.

“In the municipal elections of November last the Conservatives co-operated very loyally and energetically with the Liberal Unionists, with results most satisfactory to the Unionist party and especially to yourself. . . . I own that when you informed me on Tuesday afternoon (April 2) that no such agreement had ever been come to, that the Liberal Unionists insisted on their right to contest the seat with a candidate of their own, and to receive the full support of the Tories, and that my candidature would not be supported by the Liberal Unionists, and, if persisted in, would probably result in the loss of the seat to the Unionist party, I was completely taken by surprise, and all the grounds on which I had given the deputation to understand that I might be able to accept their invitation were shattered. . . . As far as I am concerned, you endeavour to embroil me with my friends in Birmingham by insinuating, and by seeking to make it appear, that I have played fast and loose with them, although in dealing with the incident I have regarded your interests a great deal more than my own; and in respect of the Conservative party in Birmingham, they are rewarded by an acrimonious attack from you on their leaders, by contumely and denunciation being poured upon men to whom they owe much, and whose services they highly value; and finally, in order that insult may be heaped upon injury, you allow the Liberal-Unionist Association, which is completely under your control, at a meeting over which you presided, to set forth in a formal and written resolution an assertion so questionable as to be almost ridiculous, to the effect that the recent election has shown ‘that the preponderance of political power in Central Birmingham is with the Liberal-Unionist party. . . . The Conservative party in Birmingham cannot now number much less than 25,000 voters, and their organisation is very efficient. For years and years that party was kept by your ‘Caucus’ and by the genius of Mr. Schnadhorst in a condition of intolerable political subjection. Public life in any shape, so far as their own town was concerned, was closed to them; they were not for years allowed to hold a public meeting. They were the constant butt for every conceivable shape of Radical ridicule. But their courage and spirit never faltered, and by dint of labours and perseverance beyond praise, as they are beyond description, they had almost emancipated themselves in 1885. The events of 1886 throw you and your friends, who had been their arch-enemies, absolutely into their hands; you were at their mercy. They consented to forego their easy triumph, and assisted you and your friends to maintain your Parliamentary position, and I think it is quite possible that in this attitude they might have persisted with perfect good humour.” After some words of warning (pointed with personal allusion to Lord Hartington and Sir Henry James) on the anomalous position of the Liberal Unionists, Lord Randolph

Churchill concluded : "In any case, I do not hesitate to suggest to you, that it does appear to be your duty, if the strength of the Unionist party is your object, to moderate pretensions which seem to err in the direction of exaggeration, to conciliate rather than to provoke, to treat the Conservative leaders in Birmingham with that consideration and respect which justice and diplomacy alike demand, and to recognise that a political party, such as are the Tories of Birmingham, with such a history in the past and such prospects in the future if they choose to exert their strength, possess an indisputable title to adequate direct Parliamentary representation."

Mr. Chamberlain at once replied in the following letter, which closed for a while the unfortunate correspondence, although it did not succeed in removing the general impression that both the ministerial leaders and Mr. Chamberlain were equally little desirous of seeing Lord Randolph Churchill returned to Parliament for Central Birmingham :—

"Highbury, Moor-green, Birmingham, April 23.

"MY DEAR CHURCHILL,—I have read with great interest the long letter which you have addressed to me and forwarded to the newspapers, and I will endeavour in all humility to profit by the advice you have tendered to me, although I fear that the task of reconciling conflicting views and interests has not been made more easy by your communication.

"I observe that you blame me for not having suggested arrangements by which, in future electoral contests, the two sections of the Unionist party might work together cordially to their mutual advantage; but it appears to have escaped your attention that Mr. Rowlands and his friends, at their last meeting, passed a resolution formally suspending all relations with the Liberal-Unionist party until a satisfactory explanation had been offered by its leaders of the alleged breach of compact. This explanation I have now afforded, and I do not think that there is any serious discrepancy between your statement and mine as to the facts in reference to the recent controversy. My recollection differs from yours on some points; but it does not appear to me to be worth while to pursue this part of the subject further, and I am content to leave my explanation and your statement side by side for the judgment of the public.

"As regards future action, it appears to me that it would be desirable, in the first instance, that some effort should be made to ascertain the true position of parties in the Central Division. I should be glad if the Conservatives would consent to make a joint canvass with the Liberal Unionists of the Division, or of representative portions of it, and it is my present conviction that the result would show that the Conservative party is weaker, and that the Liberal Unionists are stronger, than has hitherto been supposed. When this point has been set at rest, I think it

might be desirable that a representative of both sections of the Unionist party from all the divisions of Birmingham should meet to consider the whole question as affecting the municipal and parliamentary representation, and that they should endeavour to agree on recommendations which might afterwards be submitted to the respective divisional councils for ratification. If they should be unable to agree, their differences might be referred to the arbitration of the leaders of the Unionist party in London. By this arrangement the rank-and-file of our respective local organizations would be associated with any decision that might ultimately be arrived at, and its literal execution would thus be ensured. I shall welcome any assistance you may be able to render me in securing the above or any other amicable settlement of the misunderstanding that has unfortunately arisen.—I am, yours very truly,

“ J. CHAMBERLAIN.

“ The Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill, M.P.”

On the other hand Mr. Rowlands and Sir James Sawyer addressed to the Birmingham *Daily Gazette* their official replies to the letters published by Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues, in which proofs of the compact were asked for. Mr. Rowlands, in the course of his narrative of the negotiations, drew attention to alleged admissions made by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Alderman Powell Williams, and Mr. Alderman Johnson, and declared that these admissions proved that there was a local understanding “ by which Lord Randolph Churchill was to be brought forward by the Conservatives,” in which case Mr. Chamberlain said the Liberal Unionists “ would support him.” Mr. Powell Williams said “ they would not oppose him,” and Mr. Johnson said “ they would accept him.” They also proved that Mr. Chamberlain prevented his lordship accepting that invitation by telling him his candidature “ would certainly be regarded with disfavour by Liberal Unionists in all parts of the country, and would probably result in the loss of the seat.” Mr. Rowlands continued: “ We, however, say that it was agreed that Birmingham should be treated separately from the Unionist alliance as a whole, and that the compact was this :—

“ 1. That Lord Randolph Churchill was to be invited by both wings of the Unionist party to be the Unionist candidate.

“ 2. That this compact was made with me by Mr. Powell Williams, and that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was aware of it and approved of it.

“ 3. It was broken by the Unionist Liberals declining to join in the invitation to his lordship, and by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain dissuading him from accepting the invitation. I had many interviews with Mr. Powell Williams, at which this matter was discussed, at some of which third parties were present. I have also much correspondence on the subject; but, to keep the letter

within reasonable limits, I refer at present only to some such interviews and letters."

Mr. Rowlands, after detailing conversations with Mr. Powell Williams, proceeded:—"It is absolutely untrue to say that the Conservatives had determined to run Lord Randolph Churchill at all hazards" on any other terms than with the cordial support of the Unionist Liberals. "Up to the 28th of March we had been working with Mr. Powell Williams and his friends in perfect harmony and the utmost cordiality, and without one word of complaint from any one of them." "In conclusion," said Mr. Rowlands, "I beg to submit that the above statement of facts, corroborated as it is by accompanying letters, conclusively proves our points—namely:—

"1. That we had a compact by which Lord Randolph Churchill was to be adopted as the Unionist candidate by both wings of the Unionist party.

"2. That the Unionist Liberals committed a breach of such compact; and

"3. That there was an intrigue to prevent Lord Randolph Churchill accepting the invitation to stand for Central Birmingham.

"If instead of manœuvring to prevent Lord Randolph Churchill accepting the invitation, Mr. Chamberlain had frankly informed us of his difficulties, he would have found we should have sympathised with him, and endeavoured in some way to have removed them."

Here, so far as the public generally were concerned, the squabble among the Birmingham party leaders was allowed to rest, and although the opinion might have prevailed that the electors by whom Mr. J. A. Bright had been returned were Conservatives rather than Liberal Unionists, there was undeniable evidence that the latter party were not as impotent in Parliament as Lord R. Churchill prophesied they would be among the electorate. The whole course of legislation since the meeting of Parliament proved the influence they were exercising over the policy of the Cabinet. By the Scotch Local Government Bill, the system of free elementary education in Scotland had been virtually conceded; in Ireland the prison rules had been modified in a sense favourable to the claims of the Irish "political" offenders, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget had relieved the middle-class income-tax-payers and other classes at the expense of the owners of large landed estates, by recognising the principle of increased Succession Duties. These were a few only among the signs of the new position which the Conservatives were preparing to take up, and of their willingness to modify their traditional programme in view of the advancing claims of the democracy.

CHAPTER III.

National Liberal Union—Lords Hartington and Derby at Birmingham—Speeches by Mr. Morley and Mr. A. J. Balfour—The Home Office and Major Le Caron—Liquor Traffic in India and Africa—Official Salaries—The Falcarragh Evictions—The Naval Defence Bill—Lord Derby at the Liberal Union Club—Nonconformist Unionist Alliance and Mr. A. J. Balfour—Sir W. Harcourt at Bromley—Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—The New Code—University Representation—Welsh Disestablishment—Intermediate Education in Wales—Lord Wolseley on Military Affairs—Political Speeches by Lord Hartington, Sir Henry James, and Mr. John Morley—Perpetual Pensions—Mr. Labouchere and the House of Lords—An Anti-Vivisection Debate—London Coal Dues—Lord Salisbury and the Primrose League—Women's Liberal Federation at the Grosvenor Gallery—Speech from Mr. Parnell—Mr. Goschen at Sheffield—Future action of the Irish Party—Scotch Local Government Bills—Excessive Sentences—Lord Lytton and the French Exhibition—Irish Drainage Bills—Board of Agriculture—Bimetallism—Resignation of Sir Hercules Robinson—Mr. Goschen and the Liberal Union Club—Mr. Chamberlain at Bacup—The Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland.

THE chief event of the Easter recess was the first annual assembling of the National Liberal Union at Birmingham, under the presidency of Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham. W.*). The proceedings extended over three days (April 24–26), and included a Conference and two public meetings. Among the speakers on these occasions were some of the more prominent Parliamentary leaders of the Liberal-Unionist party. Mr. Chamberlain made an important speech at the opening meeting, at which Lord Derby also spoke; on the following day Lord Selborne proposed a resolution against the repeal of the Act of Union, and dealt with the whole Irish question in a powerful address; and at the concluding meeting, a monster demonstration at which 15,000 persons were reported to be present, Lord Hartington (*Rossendale*) was the principal speaker. In his opening address Mr. Chamberlain made an indirect allusion to the dispute between the two Unionist sections in the Central Division of Birmingham. He observed that Birmingham had vindicated its claim to be the head-quarters of Liberal-Unionism, and said that even in the Central Division they had proved themselves to be a powerful force. He remarked also on the importance to the country of the continuance of the Unionist alliance, which he justified, from the Liberal point of view, by pointing to the Liberal policy of the Government, while it was both justified and rendered necessary by the position in Ireland.

Lord Derby dealt with the question of Home Rule in its effect on the Liberal party. He contended that the party had been broken up by Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and by that alone. "It was never divided," he said, "until after the Election of 1885. At that election, as we know, it voted solid. No doubt it had what it always has had, a right and left wing, and between those two sections absolute and entire agreement on all questions was not to be expected. But there was no substantial difference, no difference

that could have interfered with common action ; and when Mr. Gladstone's ill-omened declaration in favour of Home Rule was announced, the separation that ensued did not follow the lines of any earlier difference. We have among the Unionists many of the stoutest and stanchest of Radicals. It is enough to mention the honoured name of Mr. Bright, who has passed away lamented by the whole nation, and that of our distinguished president, who still is and who, we hope, will long remain with us. On the other hand, Mr. Gladstone has carried away with him not a few of those politicians who were hitherto regarded as belonging to the moderate section—men like Lord Granville, Lord Spencer, and others whom I might name as belonging to the old Whig connection. The fact is that a wholly new policy has been started upon us—one which has nothing to do with the old constitutional disputes of Radicals and Conservatives. Conservatives, no doubt, oppose Home Rule for Ireland as an innovation of the most gigantic and, as they and we both consider, of the most unnecessary kind. Liberals oppose it because in their belief it is incompatible with the political ideas which they value most—incompatible with equitable administration, with equal treatment for all religions, and with the maintenance and spread of free trade. If it is any glory or any gratification to Home Rulers that they have united formerly hostile parties in opposition to their proposals, that is a result which they may fairly boast of. As Liberal Unionists, it is enough to say that we stand on our old ground ; that we have not lowered our flag ; that we have not deserted our leaders ; that we fought by their side the battle against Parnellism and disunion as long as they chose to fight it, and that we owe them no apology for now declining to reverse our action and to follow them into the enemy's camp."

Lord Derby also discussed the proposed safeguards to be provided on the granting of Home Rule. He held that these limitations would not be enduring. "We feel," he said, "that if we were ourselves Irish Nationalists we should not be content with so mere a shadow of power, and it is idle to expect anybody will be content. I do not go so far as some people to say there is absolutely no alternative between Union and Separation, but I do contend that if we are not to maintain the existing Union, Ireland must not be a sham, but a real nationality. It must have its own army, its own navy, its own diplomacy, its own tariff, possibly its own favoured and dominant Church—are we prepared to grant that or not ? If we are, let us say so at once, and end a bitter and vexatious conflict ; but if we are not so prepared, and I believe very few people are, it is surely better to stand on the firm ground which we now occupy, than to plunge into a system of concessions, one of which will inevitably involve another, and to be perpetually dragging on, saying at every new surrender 'This must positively be the last.' That is a policy to my mind without dignity, without grace, and without sense."

In his speech as chairman of the great public demonstration in Bingley Hall (April 26), Mr. Chamberlain paid an eloquent tribute to the memory of Mr. Bright. He remarked that, in the crisis produced by Mr. Gladstone's alliance with Mr. Parnell, "men looked to Mr. Bright as to the only guide whose authority and whose past services and whose tried experience could compare with Mr. Gladstone's, to see whether he too had accepted the new gospel which had been so suddenly revealed." "In that crisis," Mr. Chamberlain went on to say, "Mr. Bright stood firm—firm in the ancient ways of Liberalism—and he repudiated altogether the new doctrines." Referring to what he described as "the arrogant pretensions" of the party led by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chamberlain said: "they claim, forsooth, a soleright to the inheritance of the Liberal party. They are bastard sons of Liberalism, and we are the true heirs." In another passage of his speech, in which he recalled some events at the end of 1885, when it was rumoured that Mr. Gladstone was intending "a tremendous change of front—that he was going to accept a policy of Home Rule from Mr. Parnell and the Irish Nationalists—" Mr. Chamberlain observed:—"That statement—these rumours were immediately contradicted. The ex-Premier wrote to the papers, or caused a communication to be sent to the papers, and he begged his friends not to take any unauthorised or unauthentic account of his intentions. We did not believe that he contemplated a great *coup* of this kind; we could not believe that he would carry through such a tremendous change of front without communicating it to any of his colleagues or any of his political associates. I remember I went down to Warrington and made a speech in which I referred to Mr. Parnell's claims, and said that if those were the conditions of his alliance I for one would have none of it. Lord Hartington made a speech about the same time. I think perhaps he spoke even more strongly than I did in his repudiation of any such policy; and we were followed by that distinguished soldier of fortune, Sir William Vernon Harcourt. Sir William Harcourt went further than either of us. It is a peculiarity of Sir William Harcourt to go further than anybody else. He taunted the Tories with stewing in Parnellite juice, and he took heaven and earth to witness that he, at all events, would have nothing to do with the 'unclean thing.' But in a few weeks, in a few months, we found that the reports and the rumours were true. It was the contradiction that was false. We found when the Home Rule Bill was brought into the House of Commons that Mr. Gladstone had surrendered to Mr. Parnell, and that he accepted the principle without any security as to the conditions upon which we had been taught always to insist. Then we saw a spectacle which was not very creditable to the Liberal party in this country—then we saw a wholesale process of conversion. Then Sir William Harcourt was the first to go. There is no man who has ever shown such surprising agility in turning upon himself. I remember when I

was at the Board of Trade I was, in a certain sense, responsible for the lighting of our coast, and at one time there was talk of putting a new light, and a light of great importance, upon one of the principal landfalls. The light was described, in technical language, as being a revolving light with varying periods of obscurity. If we could only persuade Sir William Harcourt to be fixed somewhere upon the coast, I believe he would fulfil to admiration all the functions of this new light."

Lord Hartington referred to the demonstration in favour of Home Rule which had been held in Bingley Hall in the previous November, and observing that he did not venture to claim for the demonstration he was addressing any advantage over that, proceeded to say:—"I think that there is one point at all events which tells in our favour, and which may justify our hope that somewhat more permanent results may follow from the demonstration of to-day than that which followed its predecessor. Those who met here last November did not, I think, know exactly what they wanted, and they were not told by their leaders what they ought to want. We, at all events, though there may be differences as to the exact amount of self-government which ought to be granted to our Irish fellow-countrymen, though there may be doubt as to the time and sequence of the measures which Parliament ought to pass for Ireland, though there may be differences upon points of this description, there is one thing upon which we are all agreed, and that is in our resolve that, whatever may be done or be left undone, Parliament is not to be enervated and disestablished as a factor, and a main factor, in the government of Ireland. And, gentlemen, to that contention we attach a very definite and precise meaning. We do not mean that Parliament should only retain a veto over the legislation of an Irish Parliament. We mean that Parliament shall retain the power and the means of legislating, if it thinks fit, and as it thinks fit, for Ireland like every other part of the United Kingdom. We mean that Parliament should not only retain the right to legislate, but the right to enforce that legislation. We know very well that this is not what Mr. Parnell means. Do we know whether Mr. Gladstone assents to or dissents from these conditions? When he tells us that it is an inseparable part of his policy that the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament is to be retained, unquestionably he seems to assent to that proposition. But when we look at the arguments by which he enforces his policy, when he talks to us about the iniquity by which the Legislative Union was established, when he tells us of the failure of the Imperial Parliament to legislate wisely and justly for Ireland, still more when we look at the provisions of his measures themselves, we can arrive at no other conclusion than that the effect, if not the intention, of his policy was and is practically to disestablish Parliament as a factor in the government of Ireland."

After some remarks on the beneficial results of the Unionist

alliance and on the policy of the extreme section of the Opposition, Lord Hartington continued :—"The time is at hand when it may be in the power of the Unionist party to show that its policy is not merely a negative policy of the maintenance of the Union and of order, but that it is a policy which is capable of conferring actual, positive benefits and beneficial legislation upon the people of Ireland. The time is at hand when it may be in the power of the Unionist party to take up the work which was abandoned three years ago by the Liberal party, and which has been interrupted by three years of constant agitation and of conflict. What are these matters with which Parliament may shortly be called upon to deal? In my opinion the first and the most urgent question to which the Unionist party ought to direct its attention is the condition of the comparatively limited districts where the constant pressure of poverty and want of employment produce such chronic discontent and chronic disturbance, which re-acts over the whole country. The condition of those districts requires the attention of Parliament on account of the political influence which they exercise over affairs and over the whole of Ireland. We are never very far removed from the possibility of some frightful calamity in those districts through the accident of a bad season or the failure of a crop. We may be brought any day face to face with the existence of hunger, and want, and famine. That is a matter with which, in my opinion, Government is first and most urgently called upon to deal. . . . But there are other matters, I fully admit, with which the Unionist party is called upon to grapple, and I believe is at no distant time prepared to grapple. We have admitted that behind the desire for independence there does exist on the part of large numbers of the Irish people a legitimate desire for the extension of their powers of self-government. We admit that the desire is perfectly legitimate, but we are bound to submit, at the same time, that there is a risk, a difficulty, and a danger in giving a full realization to that legitimate desire. What is that danger? It is that we know by experience in the past that the powers of local self-government which they already possess are not used in Ireland as they are used here—exclusively and for the purpose for which they were conferred—but are used too often for the purpose of attacking political enemies or satisfying political jealousies and animosities. Why should this be so? What is the reason why Irishmen should abuse powers of local self-government which are used, and freely used, without any of these consequences by Englishmen and Scotchmen? Our opponents would probably tell us that it is because Irishmen are thoroughly dissatisfied with their whole system of government, and that it is not by an extension of local liberties, but only by the grant of national independence, that they can ever be satisfied. Is that contention proved?" Lord Hartington held that it was far from being proved. He expressed the hope that the land question might be satisfactorily settled,

and concluded an able speech by declaring that, much as the union of hearts and affections between the several parts of the Kingdom was to be desired, no such union was possible unless it was founded on mutual respect.

In a speech at Bedford (May 1), in which he replied generally to the Unionist addresses at the meetings of the National Liberal Union, Mr. John Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) formulated a number of charges against the Government, which he stated as follows:—“(1) That in the autumn of 1886 they refused to listen to the voices of the Irish members with respect to a measure of relief for the tenants; (2) that, though in 1887 they assented to the proposition which they had scorned in 1886, they did not deal with arrears; (3) that to meet the very moderate amount of disturbance which arose from this neglect they introduced a Coercion Bill and suspended trial by jury in cases when it was most needed; (4) that, having substituted police tribunals for juries, they put every obstacle possible in the way of appeals; (5) that they made new crimes at the will of the Lord-Lieutenant of combinations which otherwise would have been perfectly innocent, and for such crimes punished a large number of members of Parliament; (6) that they had allowed the imposition of savage sentences—he did not believe that in modern times there had been a more shameless sentence than that of six months’ hard labour imposed on Mr. Edward Harrington; (7) that they had taken no pains to proportion prison treatment to the character of the offences; (8) that men had been done to death at Mitchelstown without any proper inquiry being held; and (9) that they had placed all the information and all the inducements at the disposal of the Crown Solicitor at the service of the *Times* newspaper, and had turned what ought to have been a chance to the Irish members of clearing their characters into a State prosecution.” Dealing with the question of local government, as raised in Lord Hartington’s speech, Mr. Morley observed that the coercive policy of the Government exasperated the Irish people, and made them resolved to use any extension of local government in order to procure for themselves what they wanted—a central government which would give them control over their own affairs. As to the constitution of such a government he made light of the difficulties raised by Lord Derby, and asked whether, if the English people really made up their minds to give powers of self-government to Ireland, it could be supposed that the political genius of England, which had studded the whole globe with forms of government of every kind, from the military despotism of India through the responsible government of our Colonies up to our own free system, was unable to frame a scheme for such a purpose. All the supposed difficulties would disappear, he urged, when “the common sense of Home Rule” was seen by the people of Great Britain. On the same evening (May 1), Mr. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) addressed a large meeting at Manchester, and in the course of

his speech drew a graphic picture of the operations of the Plan of Campaign, by putting a supposititious case of refusal on the part of a tenant in Lancashire to pay his rent or to give up his holding, notwithstanding proposals for friendly compromise from the landlord. By way of further illustration of the Plan of Campaign, he quoted the actual case of a tenant, the rent of whose holding was 2*l.* a year. He had demanded a reduction, part but not all of which the landlord was willing to concede. The difference between the demand and the landlord's offer was about 1½*d.* a week. "On a question of 1½*d.* a week," said Mr. Balfour, "this man, in obedience to priests and politicians, has seen himself driven out of his house; he has seen himself and his wife and his children left without a roof; he has seen himself turned into a pensioner of the Land League without any prospect, as far as I can see, but the poor-house in the distance."

The House of Commons on its reassembling (April 29), after the Easter recess, resumed the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates in Committee of Supply. On the vote for the salaries and expenses of the Treasury, Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) moved a reduction of 3,000*l.* each in the salaries of the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wanted, he said, to get rid of the arbitrary difference between the salaries of some Ministers and those of others, and he proposed to adopt the lower scale of 2,000*l.*, because it corresponded more nearly to the salaries of Ministers in America and on the Continent of Europe. The motion was negatived by 100 to 30, and a motion by Mr. E. Robertson (*Dundee*), for a general reduction of 1,000*l.*, on the alleged ground that sufficient information was not given as to the audit of the Civil List expenditure, was negatived by 141 to 72. Mr. J. Ellis (*Leicestershire, W.*) moved the reduction of the vote for the Home Office by 1,000*l.* A long discussion followed on the action of the Home Secretary in connection with the inquiry before the Special Commission, and particularly with reference to Mr. Anderson's communications with the witness Le Caron, and the confidential documents he had handed to the latter. Mr. John Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*), Sir G. Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*), and Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) complained of the conduct of the Home Office, which was defended by Mr. Matthews (*Birmingham, E.*), Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*), and the Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*). A letter written by Mr. Anderson to the *Times*, in reply to an attack from Sir W. Harcourt, and in explanation and defence of his own proceedings, was characterised by Mr. Morley as "mean and insolent"; while Sir George Trevelyan insisted that permanent civil servants should not be allowed to make controversial replies to attacks made upon them in the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer replied that civil servants were "but human," and said that while there was wisdom in the rule which generally imposed silence upon them, there was a corre-

sponding obligation on ex-Ministers not to attack permanent officials in immoderate language.

Mr. S. Smith (*Flintshire*) called attention (April 30) to the Abkari Department in India, and moved a resolution in which he challenged the whole policy of the Indian Government in regard to the liquor traffic in that country. He contended that the present fiscal system led to the establishment of new spirit distilleries and liquor and opium shops where they had not previously existed, and these increased facilities for drinking, which he attributed entirely to the policy of the Indian Government, spread misery and ruin among the industrial classes to an extent that was inconceivable. Mr. Caine (*Barrow*), who seconded the motion, observed that the various Governments of India, in spite of themselves, were inevitably committed by the excise laws to a policy of expansion instead of restriction, and that the sale of liquors and drugs was stimulated all over India for the sake of the revenue it produced. He suggested as a remedy for the present state of things an increase of duty on proof spirit, and also the imposition of some duty on the heavy beer brewed in India. In the course of the discussion which followed, Sir John Gorst (*Chatham*) indignantly denied the charges against the Indian Government, and showed that in the city and islands of Bombay the consumption of liquor had enormously decreased, while the revenue had largely increased. What had occurred in the other provinces tended, he said, in the same direction, and he declared that the general policy of the Government was intended to bring about similar results throughout the country. On a division the resolution was carried by 118 to 103. The second reading of the Leaseholds Enfranchisement Bill was moved by Mr. Lawson (*St. Pancras, W.*) (May 1), and an amendment was moved by Viscount Lymington (*Devonshire, N.*), declining to consider the question until the House had before it the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the subject of town holdings. The second reading was negatived by 186 to 157, and the amendment was agreed to.

In Committee of Ways and Means (May 2) a resolution to impose an estate duty on personalty, devolving by will or intestacy, of the value of 10,000*l.* and upwards was agreed to. On the resolution imposing a similar estate duty on successions of 10,000*l.* and upwards, whether on personalty or realty, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) said in answer to Mr. Childers (*Edinburgh, S.*), that it was intended that in cases where there was absolute power of disposal the value of the realty should be taken according to the capital value of the succession. Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*) approved of the principle of graduated taxation, which was involved in the limitation of the new duty to estates above 10,000*l.* The Chancellor of the Exchequer explained that the limit of 10,000*l.* was adopted as being analogous to the limit which had been adopted for ex-

emptions from income tax, and protested against the suggestion that the Government were thereby opening up a general system of graduated taxation. In Committee of Supply (May 2), Mr. Jennings (*Stockport*) moved to reduce the Foreign Office vote by 1,000*l.* He remarked that there had been a general rise in the scale of payments under the vote since the first year of Lord Beaconsfield's administration. Some persons had asked him, he said, with alarm, "What are we to do with our younger sons?" and his reply was that England had been making provision for younger sons for a very long time; but there were many signs that the people were getting weary of doing so, and intended in the future to exact services for the salaries that were paid. The motion was negatived by 84 to 63, and a further motion for reduction, having reference to the warlike disputes of traders in the region of Lake Nyassa, was also negatived, and the vote was agreed to. The Colonial Vote was agreed to (May 3), after discussions had taken place on the treatment of prisoners in Cape Colony, and on the Bill passed by the Legislature of Western Australia, giving to the colony a responsible government. On the report of Supply (May 6), Mr. Dillwyn (*Swansea*) moved the reduction of the Colonial Vote by 50*l.*, in order to call attention to the massacre on the Gold Coast. Two natives had been tried and acquitted, but the Governor had got a bill passed after their acquittal, by means of which they were again imprisoned. Mr. Ritchie (*St. George's, E.*) said that the whole question was about to be inquired into, and the amendment was negatived. A long discussion took place on going into Supply (May 8), on a motion by Mr. S. Smith (*Flintshire*), calling attention to the opium trade in China, and urging the Government to intimate to the Chinese Government that in the next revision of the Treaty of Tientsin, full power would be given to extinguish the trade if it thought fit. Sir J. Gorst (*Chatham*) pointed out that the whole amount of opium sent from India was considerably less than one-third per cent. of the Chinese consumption, and that to violently extinguish the trade would inflict great hardships upon the poor natives of India for the benefit of Chinese, Persian, and Turkish producers. The motion was negatived by 165 to 88.

The House of Lords reassembled after the Easter vacation on April 30. Lord Meath on that day brought in a Bill "to enable women to be elected as County Councillors." The measure had evident reference—though the fact was not avowed—to the doubts thrown on the validity of Lady Sandhurst's election as a member of the County Council of London. On the motion for second reading (May 20) the Bill was rejected by 108 to 23. The second reading of the Horseflesh (Sale for Food) Bill was moved (May 2), by Lord Beauchamp, who explained that the Bill was based on the same principle as the Margarine Act, namely, that people should not be deceived into buying what they did not want. The Bill was not intended to prevent the sale of horseflesh to

persons who wanted it, but some protection was required against its being foisted upon purchasers as ordinary butchers' meat. The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee for General Bills. After undergoing several amendments it was (May 28) read a third time and passed. Lord Herschell brought in a Bill (May 2) for codifying the law relating to the sale of goods, which was read a second time (May 20) but was not further proceeded with. An important discussion on the liquor traffic among African races was initiated (May 6) by the Duke of Westminster, who appealed to the Government to mitigate the evils arising from this traffic by restriction, and, where possible, by prohibition. He said that in the opinion of some of the natives the traffic in liquors was worse than the slave traffic. Under the great heat prevailing the habit of drinking strong drinks had reduced the natives to absolute ruin and misery. The noble duke quoted testimony from missionaries, traders, and travellers all pointing to the most grievous demoralisation and debasement as the result of "the white man's rum and gin." Lord Carnarvon, who supported the appeal of the Duke of Westminster, said that the Cape Colony had passed very good laws in regard to the importation and sale of liquor, but there was a difficulty in enforcing them. After some remarks from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who compared the native races to children with strong passions and little power of self-control, Lord Knutsford stated that the Government fully recognised the importance of the subject, and promised that they would continue their efforts to keep down the liquor traffic.

The action of the police at the Falcarragh evictions, and the arrest of Mr. Harrison and Mr. Conybeare (*Camborne*), were made the ground of a motion (May 6) by Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) for the adjournment of the House. The charge against Mr. Conybeare being still before the Courts, the Speaker held that no reference could be made to that charge or the circumstances attending it. Mr. Atherley Jones therefore confined his observations to the case of Mr. Harrison, who had been acquitted, and whose arrest he condemned as illegal and unconstitutional. The Solicitor-General for Ireland (*Dublin University*) maintained that Mr. Harrison had put himself in the wrong and was rightly arrested. After observations from several members, and a lengthy account of his experiences at Falcarragh from Mr. Conybeare, Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) said that to cheer a prisoner, or give bread for the purpose of assisting a man to commit an offence, was a breach of the law in England as well as in Ireland; and although Mr. Harrison was acquitted, and must therefore be assumed to be innocent, a sufficient *prima facie* case existed to justify his arrest, especially in view of his refusal to give his name. As to the system of espionage of which Mr. Conybeare complained, Mr. Balfour pointed out that English members of Parliament and others were known to go over to Ireland and stimulate disorder,.

and where the police had reason to believe that this was their object, or that disorder would result from their interference, they were justified in watching them. Sir William Harcourt (*Derby*) indignantly repudiated the legal propositions of the Chief Secretary, and characterised his reply as "the language of insult and insolence." Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*), who also joined in the debate, said that a tendency to excess and to illegality had begun to be perceptible in the action of the police in certain districts of Ireland, adding that this was not to be wondered at, because the police took their tone from the speeches of members of the Government. Liberty in Ireland, he asserted, did not enjoy the guarantees that belonged to it in England, and he challenged the Government to enforce in England, Scotland, or Wales the doctrines they had laid down as regarded the administration of the law in Ireland. After a reply from the Solicitor-General (*Plymouth*), the motion was negatived by 250 to 153.

Lord George Hamilton (*Ealing*) moved (May 6) the second reading of the Naval Defence Bill, which was read a first time on April 8. Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) moved its rejection. He did not object, he said, to any expenditure necessary for defensive purposes, but he contended that the present proposals were aggressive in their object. Referring to a statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, that the new standard of the Fleet was that it should be equal to any two navies in the world, Mr. Labouchere said he was shocked at such a declaration. This was really a gauntlet thrown down to Europe, threatening in effect that "whatever you spend we will spend double." Great Britain was playing a game of poker with all Europe, ships of war being the stakes. He would suggest, he said, that Her Majesty's Government should call together a European Conference and should propose to it three points—first, that private property at sea should be safe from capture unless it were contraband of war; secondly, that it should be defined by common consent what was contraband of war; and thirdly, that the Conference should settle the position as to belligerent warships when in neutral harbours. If these three points were adhered to, and this country did not meddle with European disputes, there would be exceedingly little chance of war, and the safety of the country would be far better insured than by building an excessive navy. Sir Wilfrid Lawson (*Cockermouth*) seconded the rejection of the Bill, on the ground that no case had been made out for the proposed expenditure, and that the present navy was strong enough for the defence of the country. Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton*; *E.*) complained that the proposal was directly contrary to the naval policy enunciated by the First Lord of the Admiralty in 1887 and 1888. The Naval Minister then advocated a decrease in naval expenditure, and declared against any wholesale building of ships, and he (Mr. Fowler) challenged Lord G. Hamilton to reconcile those views with his present policy. He objected, how-

ever, to the Bill mainly on the ground that it initiated an entirely new system of voting money which was directly contrary to constitutional precedent, and he protested, moreover, against the House being deprived for five years of the control over naval expenditure. The discussion of the Bill was continued at a morning sitting (May 7), when, after speeches from Colonel Hill (*Bristol, S.*), Admiral Mayne (*Pembroke Boroughs*), and other members, Lord Charles Beresford (*Marylebone, E.*) said he desired to call attention to two points. First, the First Lord of the Admiralty had told the people, and the people believed, that the Bill before the House would meet the full requirements of the country; secondly, the First Lord had said that the addition to the fleet would be extra to the making up of arrears of ship-building and wastage year by year. Lord Charles Beresford contended that neither of these statements was in accordance with the facts, and he supported his view by a somewhat detailed reference to naval statistics. He admitted that there was much merit in the Bill, and that the Government could not well have done more than they proposed to do, but he objected to the Bill being represented to the country as affording full satisfaction of its necessities. It was really only an instalment of the nation's requirements. In replying to these criticisms Lord G. Hamilton said that Lord C. Beresford took an exaggerated view of the strength of foreign navies. He affirmed that the return furnished by the Government—the accuracy of which was questioned by Lord Charles Beresford—was neither inaccurate nor misleading. An exhaustive inquiry had, he said, been made as to the wants of the Navy, and a sufficient sum had been asked for, not only to provide the necessary ships, but also their equipment of guns and stores. As regarded the financial part of the scheme, it was a check, not only on the House, but on the Executive. The Government had no intention of preventing the House from exercising complete control over the expenditure; but if the Executive wished to make any departure from the scheme at any future time they would have to come to the House and make a definite statement. The scheme did not in any way weaken the control of Parliament, while it gave the Admiralty a latitude which would conduce to economy and efficiency.

The Bill was then read a second time, the motion for its rejection being defeated by a majority of 141. It passed through Committee without modification otherwise than by the addition, at the instance of the First Lord of the Admiralty, of a clause providing for the laying before Parliament of a summary of contracts (May 13 and 14). On the motion for the third reading (May 17), Mr. Howell (*Bethnal Green, N.E.*) moved the rejection of the Bill, and was followed by Mr. Pictou (*Leicester*), and Sir George Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*), the former of whom objected to the measure on grounds of general policy, and the latter because of its financial proposals. The Bill was again

defended by Lord George Hamilton, and was attacked by Sir Wm. Harcourt (*Derby*), who said that an unnecessary scare had been raised, and that the proposed expenditure was not required. A desultory discussion, which necessitated the adjournment of the debate, ensued, and was continued on the debate being resumed (May 20). Mr. Fenwick (*Wansbeck*) complained that the front Opposition Bench had not vigorously opposed the Bill, and Mr. Shaw Lefevre (*Bradford, Central*) answered for himself that he had given it an uncompromising resistance. Arguments for and against the measure, which had already been urged, were advanced again by numerous speakers, and Lord Chas. Beresford (*Marylebone, E.*) predicted that the imperfect manner in which the Government had dealt with the question would make another demand necessary within the next few years. Ultimately the Bill was read a third time by 183 to 101.

Lord Derby was entertained at dinner at Willis's Rooms by the Liberal Union Club (May 7), and in the course of his speech in reply to the toast of his health defended the action of Parliament in the appointment of the Special Commission. He observed that "what Parliament actually did was this. Mr. Parnell was challenged to test the question at issue—the question of the charges against him—in a Court of law. He refused, because he said he could not get justice in England. He was reminded that it was open to him to have the case tried in Scotland or Ireland. He did not like that either, although, after the appointment of the Commission—not before—he changed his mind and went into a Scotch Court. He or his friends asked for an inquiry before a Parliamentary Committee. That was on various and obvious grounds an inconvenient and, indeed, an impossible tribunal; but the Government met him half-way, and the Commission was appointed, which is still sitting. I do not see what more or what else they could have done if he had been a friend instead of an opponent. Whatever suspicion may have attached to Mr. Parnell in connection with the matter arose, as I have said elsewhere, from his own undisguised reluctance to have the charge investigated. And when I bear in mind two things—one the shout of exultation that arose from the Home Rule party when the forgeries were discovered, showing pretty clearly what their previous uneasiness had been, and the other the extreme diligence with which they laboured before the trial to represent the tribunal as an unfair one, and so discount the effect of a possibly adverse judgment—I cannot but think that their feeling is that of a man who is aware that he has had a lucky and a narrow escape." Turning to the more general Irish question, Lord Derby said he would not go over again the old stock arguments against Home Rule. "But when," he proceeded, "we say that the Irish Nationalists will never be satisfied with a Parliament subordinate to the Imperial Parliament, we are always told that we are calumniating them that feelings have changed, that conciliation on

one side has produced moderation on the other, and so forth. Well, upon that point a little bit of very recent evidence has come to light opportunely. At a dinner given at Dublin about a fortnight ago, Mr. John Redmond was one of the speakers. He is a very fair representative of the Irish Nationalist members; not one of the most violent, but an average specimen. What is his language?—

“Ireland, marked out as she was from the very first by the finger of Omnipotence as a separate and distinct nation (applause), had all the attributes of a nation long before the Norman invasion; and from the date of the Norman invasion to this moment there has been, age after age, one long and continuous struggle between this national sentiment and overwhelming odds. . . . Why, it may be asked, are we on occasions such as this asked to toast “Ireland a Nation”? Well, it seems to my mind that there is one very cogent reason—it is well for us at this time of the day, with all the signs of coming victory around us, to reassert before the world what we have so often asserted in the time of our darkness and trouble and despair—namely, to reassert what it is that this national movement means, and what it is that this national sentiment signifies from you and from me, and from the people of Ireland (cheers). What is the truth underlying this movement? I beg leave to say that this movement to-day is the same in all its essentials as every movement which in the past history of Ireland has sought with one weapon or another to achieve the national rights of this land (cheers). The truth underlying this movement to-day is precisely the same principle as that for which other generations have fought and died. It is the principle that the sons of Ireland, and they alone, have the right to rule the destinies of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) I am prepared to maintain that more than that no Irish rebel leader in the past asked, and less than that I am here to maintain that no Irish leader of the present day can or ought to accept. (Cheers.)”

“What does that mean? It does not require an interpreter. No talk here of the union of hearts. No submission here to an Imperial Parliament. No, it is, in every practical sense of the word, separation. Of course you may say we all knew before that that was what the Nationalists wanted. Yes, we knew it, but when, for party purposes, it is continually denied, there is some advantage in getting the admission direct from one of themselves. I think it goes to confirm our repeatedly expressed opinion, that which is at the bottom of our position as a party, that union is possible, that separation is possible, but that a semi-detached Ireland is not possible.”

Sir George Errington spoke on the same occasion in the character of a Unionist who had been converted from Home Rule. After some general observations, he said:—“But, gentlemen, when I venture to thank you for your kindness towards myself, I cannot help thinking of the old saying, that there is

more joy over one sinner who repents than over the ninety-nine just; and whatever the ninety-nine just may think of this somewhat one-sided arrangement, I cannot complain of it. You have treated me with the utmost kindness, you have welcomed me to the fold, you have bestowed on me the robe of honour. I should ill requite such kindness by now trespassing on your patience, yet I wish time had permitted me to lay before you some notes from the prodigal's diary. I should like to have told you what indigestible political food he found the husks of the swine; I should like to have told you by what repeated and painful processes he was most reluctantly forced to realise the true character of the company among whom he had fallen; how he saw the very men who in office had been foremost in denouncing and punishing every criminal phase of the Irish agitation, deliberately accept what I can only call fellowship in crime, and become, in the strong, but not exaggerated language of Lord Salisbury, the other day, 'patrons of outrage and advocates of anarchy.' " "It is an appalling thought," said the same speaker before he sat down, "that in the Irish agitation we have seen the wells of Christian morality poisoned, and spiritual guides for political purposes tampering with the landmarks of a nation's conscience."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) spoke at a conversazione held at Willis's Rooms (May 8), in connection with the Nonconformist Unionist Alliance. Prior to the speech of the Chief Secretary, the Rev. A. Mursell, in the course of an eloquent address, asked Mr. Balfour to tell the House of Commons that Nonconformity was not a synonym for disloyalty, but that there was an earnest band of Nonconformist ministers in England, and still more Nonconformist laymen, who were at one with their Presbyterian, their Congregationalist, their Methodist, their Unitarian brethren in Ireland in their determination to resist at all hazards what really constituted an affront to the Majesty of the British Throne. He saw no sign of wavering among Nonconformist Unionists, but a solid and serried rank, who stood undaunted amidst alarmist menaces and pessimist prediction before the shock of conflict, and determined—end that conflict how it might—to stand or fall in a cause whose crown of victory was the rose, the shamrock, and the thistle in one splendid and unbroken wreath. Mr. Balfour, after dealing at some length with various topics relating to Ireland, went on to say: "The eloquent speech which preceded my own gave you some view of what was thought by an influential section of Nonconformists in England; but the speaker gave you no idea, because probably he had not himself personal knowledge, of the condition of Nonconformist opinion in Ireland. Nonconformist opinion in England is divided. Nonconformist opinion in Ireland is not divided. I will not commit myself to the mathematical proposition that not a single unit in that great body is adverse to the present Government; but I say, without

fear of contradiction and in the presence of those who could contradict me, that not only substantially is every Protestant Episcopalian upon the side of the present Government, but that every Protestant non-Episcopalian in Ireland is also on the side of the Government. I think that is a fact which our Nonconformist and Separatist friends in England would do well to ponder gravely. These Irish friends of ours have no traditional love of a Conservative Government. The traditions of the Nonconformist party in Ireland on the whole, as of the Nonconformist bodies in England on the whole, have not been with the Conservative party. Among these men up to the year 1886 were to be found the staunchest supporters Mr. Gladstone has ever had. I do not believe, if you were to go round the borders of the three kingdoms, you would find any set of men more devoted to the Liberal cause of which Mr. Gladstone was the avowed head than the Presbyterians of Ulster and the other non-Episcopalians of Ireland. They have turned against him to a man. They have allied themselves firmly and indissolubly with those who have been, I might almost say, their hereditary political opponents. As the non-Episcopalian bodies of Ireland were among the staunchest supporters of Mr. Gladstone, so I say now that they are among the staunchest supporters of the Union and of the Conservative Government, to whom, for the moment, the cause of the Union is intrusted. And am I to be told that those men are indifferent to civil and religious liberty; am I to be told that they have cast to the winds political morality, and that they have deserted their old friends in order to tread the paths of unrighteousness with leaders they have not known before? To say such a thing is to refute it. And why are the Nonconformists of England divided on this great question while the Nonconformists of Ireland are united? Because the Nonconformists of Ireland are on the spot and know what they are talking about, and some at all events of the English Nonconformists do not know what they are talking about, but have blindly followed and have blindly bowed to the opinions of one man, and not even to the lifelong opinions of that man, but to the opinions which it has pleased him the last two years to utter and to profess."

Sir Wm. Harcourt (*Derby*) made a characteristic speech at Bromley (May 8), in which he discussed the Naval Proposals of the Government and the Budget. Turning to the Irish question, he said that the course of the Government in Ireland was to encourage the landlords in every way to proceed to extremities, and then instead of sending an arbitrator to Gweedore they sent a ram to batter down the cottages. The Liberal Unionists he described as neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring; and their alliance with the Conservatives as a hocus-pocus arrangement—a back-door compact—which would not bear the light of the constituencies. Speaking of the government of Ireland he

said that in recent generations the English people had endeavoured according to their lights to do their duty towards the Irish people. He had himself been a party to the old policy of coercion. He believed at one time that that policy, which they had no doubt inherited from their fathers, was a sound policy of government. He was now convinced by experience that it was a failure; that it had failed from generation to generation; that it had made Ireland, instead of being a strength and a pride to the nation to which she belonged, a weakness and a reproach. He could no longer be a party to that policy. He had the profoundest belief in Mr. Gladstone's new policy of conciliation and peace.

The Secretary for Scotland Bill, the object of which was to remove some doubts which had arisen under the Act constituting a Secretary for Scotland as to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for War in certain cases, was read a second time in the House of Lords (May 7), and passed that House (May 16). In moving the second reading of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill (May 9), the Duke of St. Albans advocated the measure on the familiar grounds of the example of other nations and of several of our own colonies, the evils arising in this country from the legal prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and the weight of public opinion against the present law. Lord Percy, in moving the rejection of the measure, contended that the noble Duke had made out no case for the removal of a legal prohibition which had existed for centuries. He described the supporters of the Bill as persons who held that the relationship between the husband and his sister-in-law altogether ceased on the wife's death, and twitted them with never having stated how far they would go in removing the prohibitions to the marriage of persons in close relationship. Lord Grimthorpe argued that the interdict which the Bill would remove was not founded on any theological or legal principle which ought to induce their lordships to reject the measure. Lord Selborne briefly combated that proposition, and warned the House that if marriage with a deceased wife's sister were permitted, they could not stop there; but Lord Herschell denied that there was any necessity for enlarging the scope of the Bill, and held that to permit marriage with a deceased wife's sister would not lead to a demand for the abolition of all prohibitions based on consanguinity. The Duke of Argyll upheld prohibitions so based. The Archbishop of Canterbury on scriptural and social grounds also opposed the measure. On a division the Bill was rejected by 147 to 120. The Prince of Wales, who was present on the cross benches during the debate, voted for the Bill.

The Archbishop of Canterbury drew attention in the House of Lords (May 10) to the new Code of Regulations issued by the Committee of Council on Education. He assigned various reasons for thinking that some of the alterations which would be brought about by the Code would be injurious to many of the voluntary

schools and destructive of some of them, and he urged that it should not be put in operation till it had received further consideration. The Bishop of London, Lord Harrowby, and other peers, criticised the Code in numerous particulars. Lord Cranbrook denied that the regulations to which exception was taken had been framed in any spirit of hostility to the voluntary schools. They were, however, based on the assumption that the friends of those schools did not wish them to be less efficient than the Board schools. He referred to the Report of the Royal Commission and to official statistics to justify the action of the Committee of Council in respect of the Code, and to show that the apprehension of its ill effects on the voluntary schools was unfounded. Lord Meath (May 13) moved a resolution affirming the new Code to be defective in failing to provide adequate facilities for physical education. While admitting that the Code was in many ways an improvement, he said this defect was a very serious one, as it was impossible that a generation of children should grow up healthy and strong without proper physical training. Lord Cranbrook replied that there was already some amount of physical training in elementary schools, and gymnastics were being introduced in the training colleges, and many teachers were being instructed in military drill. After a prolonged discussion, the motion was negatived without a division.

In the House of Commons (May 8), after Mr. Dixon Hartland's (*Uxbridge*) Bill for placing theatres and places of amusement in London, in regard to construction and the supervision of management, under the direct control of the Home Office, had been rejected on the motion for second reading, Mr. Milvain (*Durham*) moved the second reading of the Corporal Punishment Bill. The object of the measure, as he explained, was to abolish corporal punishment in the case of incorrigible rogues and vagabonds, but to authorise its infliction upon burglars when armed with a dangerous or offensive weapon, and in certain other cases. The Bill was opposed by Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*) and Mr. Jacob Bright (*Manchester, S.W.*), on the ground that corporal punishment under any circumstances was brutalising. Mr. Matthews (*Birmingham, E.*), while expressing no opinion on the Bill in the name of the Government, said for himself that he approved its general scope. After some discussion the second reading was carried by 194 to 126, but the Bill was not further proceeded with. A new resolution imposing an Estate Duty on mixed estates of an aggregate value of more than 10,000*l.* was agreed to in Committee of Ways and Means (May 9). In Committee of Supply (May 10), Mr. E. Robertson (*Dundee*) called attention to the representation of Universities in Parliament, and in moving a resolution in favour of the discontinuance of the privilege, contended that it was a unique anomaly, entirely opposed to the plain spirit of the existing Parliamentary system and productive of no good results. Dr. Farquharson (*Aberdeen, W.*),

who seconded the motion, characterised the University constituencies as pocket boroughs belonging to the Tory party and as refuges for the destitute. The Solicitor-General for Scotland (*Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*) pointed out that the proposal was not a practical one, but merely an abstract resolution which could not be followed by legislation, and contended that University representation was unique in its strength. It possessed, he said, not only the sanction of great antiquity, but that of recent and deliberate enactment. It was clearly beneficial to the nation at large that all interests and classes should be represented, and he asked the House to reject the motion on the ground that it was retrograde and philistine. Sir John Lubbock (*London University*) also defended University representation. Sir G. Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*) said that the University constituencies afforded the clearest case of privilege and of pluralist voters that existed. The University members, he added, unanimously opposed all great measures of reform. After speeches from Mr. Raikes (*Cambridge University*), and Mr. Plunket (*Dublin University*), the motion was negatived by 217 to 126.

In Committee of Supply (May 14), Mr. Dillwyn (*Swansea*) moved a resolution in favour of the disestablishment of the Church in Wales. Tracing the history of the Church from an early period to show that the clergy in the Principality had never done their duty to the people, he contended, not only that the vast majority of the Welsh people were Nonconformists, but that a large number of those who supported the Church did so merely because of the influence of the large territorial landlords. The Church of England in Wales, he said, had failed to fulfil its professed object, and he held that this country ought not to continue to maintain in Wales, against the will of the people, a Church which was not the Church of the Principality. Mr. G. O. Morgan (*Denbighshire, E.*), in seconding the motion, insisted that an Established Church could only exist when a clear and undoubted majority of the people were in its favour, and when it was interwoven with the moral and religious life of the people, and he denied that in Wales either of these conditions existed. Mr. Byron Reed (*Bradford, E.*) moved an amendment in which he asked the House to refuse to entertain proposals for disestablishment. He declined to distinguish between the Church in England and the Church in Wales, and strongly condemned what he alleged to be the political character of Welsh Nonconformity. Sir J. Bailey (*Hereford*), who seconded the amendment, bore testimony to the increasing influence and activity of the Church in Wales, and quoted statistics to show that Nonconformists were not so numerous as their friends seemed to imagine. Among the other speakers on the question, Mr. Raikes (*Cambridge University*) maintained that the Church in Wales was part and parcel of the English Church, whose indivisible character and historical continuity were beyond doubt; while Mr.

Stansfeld (*Halifax*) argued that a Church which did not express the views of the people was a usurpation and indefensible. On a division the motion was negatived by 284 to 231. On the following day (May 15), the House was occupied with another Welsh subject. Mr. Rendel (*Montgomeryshire*) moved the second reading of the Welsh Intermediate Education Bill, the object of which, he explained, was to establish a Board of Education for the Principality, consisting of members elected by the county councils, with power to carry out schemes for the establishment of intermediate and technical schools. The Bill also provided that the expenses of such schools should be met partly by a special rate not to exceed one halfpenny in the pound of rateable property, and partly by Government grants not exceeding the sums contributed by the counties. Mr. A. Williams (*Glamorganshire*) pointed out that while £64,000 a year was spent in connection with higher education in Scotland and £40,000 in Ireland, Wales was entirely neglected. Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*) also complained of the unfair treatment of Wales as compared with the rest of the country, and said that every post of importance in Church or State in Wales was filled with English-speaking people. These, he remarked, neither acquired the language nor gained the sympathies of the Welsh people. He could not see why the Government should oppose the Bill. By assenting to the second reading they would be merely expressing an opinion that there was a strong case of injustice, and the details of the Bill, he suggested, might safely be left for consideration in Committee. Mr. Leighton (*Shropshire, W.*) opposed the principle of the Bill, and objected to intermediate education being handed over to the county councils. After several other members had warmly supported the Bill, Sir William Hart Dyke (*Kent, N.W.*) said the Government would assent to the second reading, but some modifications would be necessary in Committee. The Bill was then read a second time. The further progress of the measure was slow, though it involved no serious discussions. The chief modification made in Committee was the substitution of a joint educational committee in each county for the county council, three of the five members of the committee being appointed by the county council, and the other two by the Lord President. The Bill was read a third time and passed (July 30).

At the invitation of the Master of Balliol, Lord Wolseley delivered an address in the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford (May 11), on the military strength of England. After enumerating the various forces by which that strength is represented—comprising 617,000 men in all—he observed that to the foreigner, accustomed to a great military machine, all of whose component pieces were perfectly constituted and organised for the part each had to play, this patchwork army of ours was a curiosity. Our insular position saved us from the necessity of maintaining a great standing army. Until some mad Prime Minister allowed a

tunnel to be made under the Channel we could afford to do with a standing army of very moderate proportions. He regretted, however, that the army was not composed of the same class of men as those from whom the police were drawn. The matter, he said, was simply one of £ s. d. If they paid the soldiers as they did the police, a soldier would feel that the greatest punishment he could be subjected to was to be discharged. It was a curious fact, but still a fact, that, when the difference in the value of money was allowed for, the pay of the soldier in the days of Cromwell and even in Queen Anne's reign was better than it was now. The pay of the mechanic or the labourer had gone on increasing with the wealth and prosperity of the country, keeping pace with the advancing prosperity of the lower classes, but the pay of the soldier lagged still far behind. Lord Wolseley eulogised military training as a means of national education, and brought into strong relief the fact that crime had almost ceased in the army. Its prisons, he stated, were half of them empty, and but for a few ruffians in each regiment who were discharged, but discharged in vain, for they always re-enlisted, the Army would be freer of legal offence than ordinary civil life.

Of political speaking out of Parliament the middle of the session produced an abundant supply. On a single day (May 15), Lord Hartington (*Rossendale*) and Sir Henry James (*Bury*) were addressing a large Unionist assembly at Bury, Lord George Hamilton (*Ealing*) was expounding the naval policy of the Government at Birmingham, and Mr. John Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) was speaking at Shoreditch. At Bury, the constituency represented by Sir Henry James, Lord Hartington paid a high compliment to his colleague as a lawyer who devoted his great talents and opportunities rather to the service of the country than to his own advancement. After some other observations Lord Hartington said :—"Great changes have taken place since I had the honour of addressing a Bury audience in the year 1885, on the eve of a general election. Old political ties have been severed, old principles have been discarded, new principles have been adopted, new alliances have been formed, and political parties stand now in a very different relation from that in which they stood when last I had the honour of addressing you. It is quite clear that there has been inconsistency somewhere, and a desertion of party and principles somewhere, and the question is—Where has been the inconsistency and who have been the deserters? Now, if we try to recall the language which we were using at that time, I for one have no difficulty in deciding, and I do not think you will have much difficulty in deciding, where has been the inconsistency and who have been the deserters. At that time we were denouncing the Conservative party for what we considered to be an unworthy alliance into which they had entered with the Irish party led by Mr. Parnell. We charged them with having entered into that alliance for the purpose of embarrassing the Liberal

Government, for the purpose of unfairly obstructing its measures and hampering its policy. I am not prepared to withdraw anything which I said at that time. I know that it is denied that any such compact as we alleged against the Conservative party existed, and it is unnecessary to go into this ancient ground of difference among us; but I do not withdraw anything which I said as to the inexpediency and, in my judgment, the unpatriotic character of any alliance for general political purposes between a great English political party and the Irish party which is led by Mr. Parnell. It is quite unnecessary that I should attempt in any way to impugn the character of the men who compose the party. I do not doubt that they are patriotic, but they are patriotic in their own sense. They do not deny they have never professed that their patriotism extends further than patriotism to Ireland. Their conduct no doubt is dictated by what they consider to be their duty to the interests of Ireland or that part of the Irish people which they represent. But they have never professed, and I do not suppose that they will profess now, that they hold in any great esteem the interests, or the honour, or the prosperity of the United Kingdom, of the British Empire, or of any part of the British Empire, except that island, that portion of the United Kingdom, which they represent. If we denounced that alliance when we thought that it had been entered into by the party to which we were then opposed, the Conservative party, nothing, in my judgment, has occurred which makes an alliance of that description more patriotic or more expedient now. But such an alliance does undoubtedly exist between other parties. It does exist now, and its existence is not denied, between the Home Rule section of the Liberal party and the Irish party, and I think that it can scarcely be denied with truth that this alliance exists not only with reference to the single object of obtaining a measure of Home Rule or self-government for Ireland, but that it is an alliance which exists over the area of the politics of the day, and that those two sections of the present House of Commons are united together for all and general political purposes—for the purpose of embarrassing the conduct of affairs by the present Government, for the purpose of obstructing their policy and their measures, and for the purpose of ejecting them from power. As I have said, the alliance which I denounced four years ago I am not going to look upon with toleration or approval now. and that, I believe, is the consideration which has guided my friends as well as myself in deciding with which party in the House of Commons we should throw in the lot of the Liberal-Unionist party."

In another part of his speech Lord Hartington reiterated his conviction that the country would not long allow the difficulties of Ireland to be made the battle-ground of mere party. He declared that, in his opinion, half the danger of the situation consisted in the fact that Ireland had been made the battle-ground of party, and while it remained so he believed the Irish question

would never be solved. He admitted that the public mind had not taken in adequately the magnitude of the evil involved, but he thought that it was beginning to awaken to that evil, and that some steps had been taken towards remedying it. The refusal of the Liberal Unionists to be dragged into opposition to the Conservative policy in 1886 was the first great step in that direction; and the willingness of the Conservative Government to enter on measures which would previously have been thought too Liberal for them to take up, was the second great step in that direction. "I confess I do not believe," continued Lord Hartington, "that this removal of important questions from party conflict will be confined solely to Irish subjects. I believe that there are questions which affect the whole of the United Kingdom, which will come soon to be considered not the property of one party or the other, but which public opinion will require that both parties should do their best to settle." He thought that the questions which would be settled by agreement between parties, by public opinion compelling parties to come to an agreement, would be more or less of a social character; while such questions as those of Church establishment, and the reform or abolition of the House of Lords, would probably be fought out on the old party lines.

Sir Henry James justified the independent action which he and other Unionist Liberals had taken by a rule of conduct which Mr. Gladstone had himself laid down in the words:—"Party, if need be, must give way, and sound argument at all hazards and all costs must rule." Proceeding to deal with the question of Home Rule in the light of its consequences, Sir Henry showed the difference between such legislative independence as Grattan claimed for Ireland, and obtained during the existence of the parliament named after him, and the administrative as well as legislative independence now demanded. At the conclusion of his speech Sir Henry James mentioned a personal incident of some importance connected with Mr. Bright. He said that on the last occasion on which Mr. Bright appeared in public he presided over a Unionist gathering at which he, Sir Henry James, was present. When Mr. Bright had finished his speech he turned to him and said, "This is probably the last speech I shall ever make. There are the notes from which I have spoken; perhaps you would like to have them, and you may read them in years to come and recollect they were the notes of the last speech I probably shall make." Those notes, Sir Henry said, he then held in his hand. The last was as follows:—"However Liberal or reforming, a great Minister should be Conservative in the true and high sense. His duty to the Sovereign and to the people demands this quality. Observe the recent course; with deviation from this confidence is shaken. I cannot follow on a path of darkness and danger. Have left our old ranks, or rather they have left us. Cannot bow down to a name, however great, when coupled with a policy and with measures which are now almost universally condemned, but

which the author of them has not the frankness and the courage to abandon."

Mr. Morley, at Shoreditch, referred to several of the measures before Parliament, and made some strong remarks on the withdrawal of the British Ambassador from Paris on an historic anniversary, lest he should be supposed to countenance the French Revolution. Proceeding to speak of Ireland he said there were a hundred arguments in favour of Home Rule, but the argument which was perhaps stronger than any other was that to govern a country without any regard to the public opinion of that country, without listening to a word which fell from those who knew the condition of the country and its needs, was surely to misgovern it. He wanted Home Rule, among other reasons, for this, that it was the only means that he, at least, could see by which they would be able to give to the people of Ireland something to interest them beyond their own dismal past history, something to work for, something that would call out the energies and the brains of Irishmen for the deliverance of their own country from the evils for which the people of this country were responsible. The effect of a plan of local government for Ireland would be that all those forces which Mr. Balfour considered he had locked up would break out again with greater force than ever. The only condition on which he could succeed was that they should have an eternity of Tory government. At Birmingham, where he addressed the Midland Union of Conservative Associations, Lord Geo. Hamilton made the interesting statement that while in France for every two francs locked up in stores on shore there was only one franc invested in ships afloat, we in England had two francs represented in sea-going ships for every one franc locked up in land establishments. He also pointed out that in our Royal Dockyards we were able to do more with 12,000 men than the French could do with 22,000. Added to these advantages was the fact that we could build ships 50 per cent. more quickly than any foreign nation.

An interesting educational debate was raised in the House of Lords (May 16) by the Bishop of Lichfield, who called attention to the evils arising from the early age at which children may leave the public elementary schools, the gravest of which was that in the interim between the period of leaving school and that of going to work the children forgot what they had learnt, and in many cases contracted vicious habits by spending their time in the streets. Lord Norton, Lord Meath, and other peers spoke in much the same sense, and Lord Cranbrook concurred in regarding the matter as one of importance. He thought, however, it would be difficult and not desirable to lay down a hard and fast line, especially as the date of leaving school and obtaining employment depended very much on locality, while in many instances the labour of children had an essential part in supporting the family household. Several Bills passed through various

stages at this period in the House of Lords with little or only formal discussion.

But while the proceedings of the Upper House lacked interest, those of the House of Commons were of a more or less sensational character. In accordance with an arrangement made some time before, Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*) brought in (May 16) his motion approving of the report of the Select Committee on Perpetual Pensions, and disapproving of the Treasury Minute for the commutation of such pensions at 27 years' purchase. In a moderate but forcible speech he insisted that the circumstances under which a pension was granted ought to be considered in determining the amount at which it should be commuted, and he referred especially to the Richmond and Grafton pensions, which were originally granted to illegitimate sons of Charles II. Mr. Hanbury (*Preston*), who seconded the resolution, protested against the notion that the descendants of national heroes and of royal mistresses had exactly the same claim on the country. Yet for anything in the Minute, he said, the sinecurists were to have the preference; at best the Nelsons and the Nell Gwynnes were to have the same pay. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) denied that Parliament had a moral right to reconsider arrangements made by its predecessors in regard to pensions, any more than it had the right to re-open the question of title to land or other property. The Treasury Minute, he observed, did not fix 27 years as a hard and fast line applicable to all cases, but that limit was merely adopted as a maximum, and although pensions had been and would be commuted on a lower basis, there were many pensions, such as those payable to the descendants of distinguished men who had done great service to the nation, which he candidly thought ought to be commuted on the 27 years' basis. The Government, however, were extremely anxious that questions relating to pensions should be carefully dealt with, and he gave an assurance that all schemes of commutation should in future be laid on the table of the House before being carried into effect. Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*), who heartily accepted the doctrine that the public faith was inviolable, would not admit that the public faith was pledged by the action of Charles II., but he declined to accept the proposition that in matters involving the public credit one Parliament was entitled to repudiate what had been done by another. He intended, however, to vote for the motion because it contained the principle that a distinction ought to be drawn between the characters of different pensions, and because he thought a very bad precedent would be set if the Government refused to endorse the unanimous report of a Committee in favour of the taxpayer. Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*) pointed out that the recommendation of the Committee was made when the value of money was higher than it is now, and the effect of the conversion of Consols on the commutation of pensions at 27 years' purchase would be an immediate saving to the

1

country of 25 per cent. and a saving of 33 per cent. in 1903. A division was taken, after the closure had been moved by Mr. Bradlaugh, with the result that the motion was negatived by 264 to 205.

A still more stirring debate, though its interest was chiefly due to its amusing character, ensued on Mr. Labouchere's (*Northampton*) motion (May 17) for the abolition of the system of hereditary legislators. Adopting a somewhat prophetic vein, Mr. Labouchere said that the hereditary legislators might still meet in another part of that building, but they could read the writing on the wall. They knew that the Liberal decree had gone forth that their days were numbered. He claimed that he was one of those who would rather reform an ancient institution than destroy it, but in this case reform was impossible. Criticising the proposals of the peers themselves for dealing with "black sheep," and buttressing the hereditary principle by a modicum of the elective principle, Mr. Labouchere said he agreed with Lord Salisbury, that they should "either leave the hereditary principle alone or make a clean sweep of the whole thing." There was nothing gained, he contended, by recruiting the House of Lords from the ranks of rich commoners, for these new men at once proceeded, like the Chinese, to ennoble their ancestors. Turning to the part taken by the House of Lords in the work of legislation, Mr. Labouchere said that there was only one instance in the last 150 years of the Lords having thrown out a Bill with the approval of the country. The House of Lords was in fact a mere committee of the Carlton Club. He emphasised the point that he was not asking members to vote on the question whether there should be one or two Chambers, but to declare that the accident of birth ought not to give anyone the right to legislate in a free and self-governed nation. Mr. Wallace (*Edinburgh, E.*), who seconded the motion, said he had found nothing in the researches of Darwin to warrant the assertion that the law of heredity guaranteed the transmission of any special knowledge, aptitude, faculties, or function. Why, he asked, were the bishops to be deserted by the principle of heredity? Was this part of the revenge which science was taking upon theology? Birth was supposed to act as a corrective to wealth, but it only allied itself to wealth, and there were thus two evils combined. No sooner had their mammoth manufacturer of soap, or mustard, or blacking, or pills, or of any other eatable, or drinkable, or usable abomination succeeded in gathering together the necessary number of hundreds of thousands of pounds, than he cast about for the ways and means of becoming a baron, and the Herald's College was ready to provide him with an illustrious pedigree going back to Henry VIII., or the Conqueror, according to the fee. Mr. Curzon (*Southport*) defended the House of Lords, and characterised Mr. Labouchere's arguments as irrelevant and worthless. The Upper House, he said, had rendered material

service in building up the fabric of the Empire. He admitted that its constitution required to be both purified and modified, and while holding it not desirable to put an end to existing hereditary legislative rights, he maintained that such rights might with advantage be qualified by extending the principle of life and representative peerages. He wished to see the House of Lords representative not merely of land or blue blood, or the Church, but of all classes and interests—not solely hereditary, but an assembly in which men should feel that they had won their promotion, and strong enough, he would not say to wrestle with or combat that House, but to balance its overweening power. He could not but feel, he added, that the reform was one which ought to be undertaken by the Conservative party. Several other members joined in the debate, Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) complaining that there was no expression of opinion on the part of the Government. Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*), who then answered for the Government, said he believed that the House of Lords had a more solidly founded popularity in the feelings of the country than any second Chamber in the world, except, perhaps, the Senate of the United States. He deprecated the creation of a second Chamber that might engage in controversies with the House of Commons. After a protest from Mr. R. C. Graham (*Lanark, N.W.*) against any kind of second Chamber, the motion was negatived by 201 to 160.

The alleged cruelties of vivisection were brought to the notice of the House (May 20) by Mr. Coleridge (*Attercliffe*) on the report of the Home Office vote, a reduction in which he moved. His remarks were a signal, on the one hand, to the anti-vivisectionists to muster against the enemy, while on the other they drew together the representatives of medical science into an opposite array. Mr. Reid (*Dumfries*) inveighed against vivisection as an imposture; Mr. Stansfeld (*Halifax*) criticised the Act under which it is regulated; the other side—and the side, as its representatives contended, of humanity—being ably taken by Sir H. Roscoe (*Manchester, S.*), Dr. Farquharson (*Aberdeen, W.*), Sir John Lubbock (*London University*), and Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Hallam*). The motion for a reduction was negatived by 171 to 50. There was a short discussion (May 21) on the third reading of the National Debt Bill, started by Sir W. Harcourt (*Derby*), who complained that the Bill made a permanent reduction in the amount of the sinking fund as fixed by Sir Stafford Northcote at a time when the country was by no means so well able to pay off debt as at present. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) replied that the reduction of interest which he had just effected was equivalent to the reduction of capital provided for in 1875. The rate of reduction, he said, would be the same, and the debt would be paid off in sixty years. After a short debate the Bill—the earlier stages of which had occasioned no discussion—was read a third time. In Committee of Supply, on

a supplementary vote of 67,163*l.* for the purchase of the Submarine Telegraph Company's lines, Mr. Raikes (*Cambridge University*) explained the terms arranged with the French Government for the establishment of a through foreign tariff, and expressed his belief that the new system, which, he said, had long been urged by the commercial community, would prove beneficial to this country, alike from an international, a postal, and a financial point of view. It would largely increase the facilities for commerce, and would in all probability give the country a profit of 15,000*l.* or 20,000*l.* a year. Several members protested against the arrangement as an extravagant and unbusinesslike one, and Mr. Henniker Heaton (*Canterbury*) moved a reduction of the vote, but the motion was negatived by 221 to 128.

A Wednesday sitting (May 22) was chiefly devoted to the Coal Duties (London) Abolition Bill, the second reading of which was moved by Sir Joseph Pease (*Barnard Castle*). Mr. Baumann (*Peckham*) took the preliminary objection that the Bill proposed to interfere with rights granted to the City of London by charter, but the Speaker overruled the objection. Sir Joseph Pease then explained the object of the Bill. Tracing the history of the coal dues from an early period, he contended that the tax was unequal and unjust in its incidence, while it was a duty on an industry in which the poor were largely interested. Mr. Baumann argued that, having regard to the increased rate which had been levied on the metropolis by the County Council, it was expedient to continue the duties for a limited period, until the County Council had had an opportunity of investigating the liabilities it had taken over. He moved an amendment to that effect. Several metropolitan members, with Mr. Joicey (*Chester-le-Street*), joined in the discussion, in which Mr. Matthews (*Birmingham, E.*) intervened to state the views of the Government. They desired, he said, that the question should be dealt with entirely as a local one, and he suggested that in view of the difference of opinion between the representatives of the metropolis and the County Council, it would be desirable to give more time for its consideration. He admitted that there was grave objection to the continuance of the coal duties on economic grounds, though, perhaps, not so much as had been represented in the interests of the poor; but the Government, he added, could not assent to a Bill which wiped out ancient rights without more inquiry. He advised that a committee should be appointed to inquire as to the obligations which the City had incurred on the security of the duties, and how far it was desirable in the interests of the public that they should be dealt with. In the further discussion that followed, Mr. Courtney (*Bodmin*) suggested that the Bill should be read a second time and referred to a hybrid committee, a course to which Mr. Smith (*Strand*) expressed his readiness to consent; but Mr. Burdett-Coutts

(*Westminster*) insisted on a division being taken on the amendment, in order that the House might express its opinion one way or the other as to the continuance of the duties. This was eventually done, when the amendment was negatived by 264 to 104. The Bill was then read a second time, after an ineffectual attempt to secure the adjournment of the debate. It was considered by a Select Committee, who inserted words in Clause 1 allowing the Corporation to impose a duty of 4*l.* a ton on coal for one year, to be applied in discharge of the debt on the Holborn Valley improvements. In Committee of the House (July 3), Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) moved the omission of these words, but the motion was negatived by 138 to 82. The Bill was read a third time and passed (July 4).

A great Primrose League meeting was held in London, at Her Majesty's Theatre (May 21), under the presidency of Lord Salisbury as Grand Master of the League. It was an occasion for expounding the objects and rejoicing over the successes of the League, to each of which ends Lord Salisbury contributed by his speech. He dwelt upon the evils which result from the separation of classes, as in purely industrial communities, where the working classes are not brought into contact with other classes. From such conditions, he said, had resulted the dangers to which in all countries the most precious institutions were exposed. "If you wish for proof," he continued, "that the bringing together of classes has a conservative effect, has a protective effect upon the institutions of the country, I will ask you just to consider this very remarkable phenomenon—namely, that in proportion as the suffrage has been extended the home counties have become the strongholds of Conservatism. It is the most striking political phenomenon of our time. And what is the cause of it? Simply that the attraction of London has brought large numbers of the upper and middle classes to dwell among the lower classes in a large area of which London is the centre, and that wherever that condition of society exists, and the classes see a great deal of each other and can influence each other, Conservative opinions become prevalent, and the institutions of the country are safe." Lord Salisbury claimed that the Primrose League, by its dependence upon voluntary effort, had done much to disestablish the professional wire-puller in politics, and remarked that one of the merits of the League was its ability to continue its activities during times of excitement and tranquillity alike.

But if the Dames of the Primrose League held the field one day, the ladies of the Women's Liberal Federation were "at home" the next. These ladies held a reception (May 22) at the Grosvenor Gallery, which was attended by some of the Parliamentary leaders of the Liberal party, including Mr. Gladstone, and by Mr. Parnell. Mr. Parnell was invited to speak, which he did, and, though his observations were almost conversational in

form, and apparently quite unpremeditated, he put the case of Ireland from the point of view of his own party with much clearness. "Until recently," he said, "we cared nothing for English public opinion, because English public opinion cared nothing for us. Nay, more, English public opinion systematically discredited and misrepresented us, and if in times past we have seemed to be indifferent to the opinion of this great country it is because the necessities of our position drove us into that attitude. We have had to struggle for our rights in circumstances of enormous difficulty. Until your great man, Mr. Gladstone, showed his countrymen that the only way to solve the Irish difficulty was by recognising the legitimate national sentiment and the national aspirations of the Irish people, we were so situated that we could not legitimately come before you and plead the cause of our country. But now those unhappy days are gone by, and I firmly believe that they never will return. We now stand on a footing of perfect equality. We stand on a common platform, a platform which we can accept as Irishmen without being false to the traditions of our country and to the legitimate aspirations of all Irishmen in all ages, and a platform which you can accept without danger to your great Empire, without a chance of disintegration or injury to the power and authority of the Queen. You have accepted that platform, we have accepted it; and in accepting it I declare that we have no ulterior object, no other view than the desire to benefit our own country by enabling her to manage her own affairs, those affairs which you have so miserably mismanaged, by enabling her to develop her resources, to govern herself justly—for it is only those who have to wear the shoe who can know where it pinches—and by enabling us to build up Ireland as a nation, not as a nation hostile to your nation, but as a sister nation, going hand in hand with you, connected as we are with you by indissoluble ties—ties which we believe must exist and can exist without harm to us. On this common ground we accepted the hand of friendship which your people proffered to us in 1885, and we are willing to go forward with you in that great work of common humanity which we believe lies before your great nation and country." Mr. Gladstone did not arrive until after Mr. Parnell had spoken. When he did arrive he shook hands with the Irish leader and entered into a close and friendly conversation with him. Like Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gladstone yielded to the pressing request of the ladies for a speech; but his remarks were of a social character only.

On the same evening (May 22) Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) addressed a Unionist demonstration at Sheffield. His speech was mainly a review of the business before Parliament, and it dealt at considerable length with the opposition offered to the Naval Defence Bill. That opposition, he pointed out, did not come from the main body of the Liberal party, which on this:

question was so disorganised that the Bill was carried by a majority of nearly two to one. Referring more particularly to a defection in the Liberal ranks, Mr. Goschen went on to say:—"But I mentioned to you just now that there was a new party. It is no longer a joke, as was imagined at first, for I can assure you that there is at present a new formal organisation, of which I believe Mr. Labouchere is the leader and Mr. Jacoby and Mr. Philip Stanhope are the whips. You have not yet and the country to-day has not realised the importance of this new genesis of political force, but the time will come when you will know all about it. I think that, if we remember the principles of the leader and the name of one of the whips of the party, Mr. Jacoby, it is highly probable that this party will be known in future as the Jacobins of the Liberal party. Well, but look to this significant fact. What is the numerical strength claimed by the Jacobins? Let me put a little statistical calculation before you. The total strength of the Opposition and the various groups of the Opposition is 290; the half of the 290 would be 145. Now the Parnellites have 85 members and the Jacobins count 70 members; add these two together—I do not know whether they overlap in any way—but otherwise add these two together, and you get a total of 155, or ten more than the half of the Gladstonian party as a whole. The consequence is that if you put these two rival—well, not rival, but these two co-operating brigades together, the followers of Mr. Parnell and the followers of Mr. Labouchere, they are more than a majority of the total Opposition."

On the following day (May 23) Mr. Parnell (*Cork City*) received deputations from various municipal corporations and public bodies in Ireland, who presented to him addresses of congratulation in reference to the confessions of the witness Pigott, examined before the Special Commission. In the course of his reply Mr. Parnell made the following important observations:—"We are told that it was our intention in this agitation of ours to subvert the authority of the Crown and to organise an armed rebellion. Speaking for myself, I cannot admit, I cannot recollect, that I have ever—certainly not in a public speech, but even in my own mind—contemplated the contingency of failure of our movement, and I have certainly never contemplated what our action would be if that movement failed. But I will say to you, gentlemen, to-night that, if our constitutional movement were to fail—and I believe when I speak thus that I speak the opinion of my 85 colleagues in the House of Commons—I say if our constitutional movement were to fail—if it became evident that we could not by Parliamentary action and continued representation at Westminster restore to Ireland the high privilege of self-government and of making her own laws in our own House at home—I, for one, would not continue to remain for 24 hours longer in the House of Commons at Westminster, and I believe, as I have said, that in that sentiment I speak the views of my

colleagues. But, more than that, gentlemen, I believe the Irish constituencies would not consent to allow us to remain, and that has been the view which our countrymen at home and abroad have always taken of our action. They do not believe that we come here as mere Parliamentarians to humbug and cheat the just expectations of our people at home. They know we came here to obtain this definite and one object, and if by the way we tried to obtain other concessions, it was because we were anxious to do good to the humbler classes of our countrymen as we went along. We would not willingly lose any opportunity of conferring benefit upon humanity or upon the oppressed wherever they were. But the most advanced section of Irishmen, as well as the least advanced, have always thoroughly understood that this Parliamentary policy was to be a trial, and that we did not ourselves believe in the possibility of maintaining for all time, or for any lengthened period, an incorrupt and independent Irish representation at Westminster. That was the position that we have always taken up. That was the position that we have always laid before the Irish people at home and abroad. I believe that that position was accepted by our countrymen everywhere as a just one, and was one which was worth a trial, and that Irishmen everywhere felt that by doing that they have not been, and are not likely to be, disappointed of the results."

The House of Lords (May 24), on the third reading of the Larceny Amendment Act, discussed the moral value of flogging as a punishment. Lord Herschell moved the rejection of the Bill on the ground that this form of punishment would brutalise the class to whom it was applied, and his views were shared by Lords Esher and Norton. The weight of opinion, however, was so strongly on the other side that the third reading was carried by 75 to 19. The Bill was sent to the House of Commons, where it was not proceeded with. The Naval Defence Bill had a smoother career in the House of Lords than it had enjoyed in the Lower House. In moving the second reading (May 27) Lord Salisbury gave a lucid exposition of the objects of the measure. Comparing the present naval strength of the country, and the ship-building programme now contemplated, with the actual and projected navies of other nations, he arrived at the result that in 1894 the British strength in ironclads and armoured cruisers will be fully equal to that of any two Great Powers. The Government could not, he said, for various reasons, have made these proposals before, but they had not been made an hour too soon. He disclaimed any feeling of alarm, but held that, as a prudent man would insure his house against risk of fire, the country ought to be insured against the risk of possible eventualities. Lord Granville assented to the view that the Navy should be an adequate one, but he deprecated anything savouring of alarm, as calculated to incite other countries to increase their navies. Lord Brassey thought that the programme provided by the Bill

did not give the ironclads and cruisers a sufficient number of auxiliaries. The Bill was read a second time, and passed through committee without amendment, the third reading being taken on May 31. The serious position of missionaries in East Africa, in view of the hostile operations carried on by the German East African Company, was the subject of a debate in the House of Lords (May 28). Lord Salisbury advised that the missionaries should leave their stations for a time, while they had yet an opportunity of doing so. He maintained that the joint blockade had been very effective, and had diminished the slave trade. The Customs and Inland Revenue Bill and the National Debt Bill—the previous stages of which had been taken without discussion—were each read a third time and passed (May 28).

After an interval of more than six weeks from the time of their introduction, the House of Commons discussed the Scotch Local Government Bills on the motion for their second reading (May 23). Mr. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling*) recognised the impartial and bold spirit in which the Government had attempted to deal with the question. But it would be necessary, he said, to carry the principle of local government in Scotland much further than was proposed by the Bills. He protested against the English Act being taken as a precedent for Scotland, and argued that a much wider and more democratic system was required, and that, at any rate, the same complete form of municipal government prevailing in the towns should be set up in the counties. As to the Parochial Boards Bill, he said a strenuous and prolonged opposition would be given to it, and he complained that the Burgh Police and Health Bill had not been again introduced. Reverting to the principal measure, he discussed the main clauses in some detail, objecting, in particular, to the omission of the service franchise, to the exclusion of married women from the County Council register, and the withdrawal from the County Council of the control of the police, while he urged that the granting of liquor licences should be transferred to elective justices of the peace. In conclusion, he referred to the provisions for the payment of school fees out of the Probate Duty grant in aid of local expenditure, and complained that the clauses as drawn were incomprehensible. He protested especially against any further assistance being given to denominational schools. Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*), replying to the questions raised by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, remarked as to the question of licensing that the matter had not been dealt with owing to the difficulty which arose in connection with the subject during the consideration of the English measure last year; and as to the police, he pointed out that although their control was not handed over to the County Council, it was transferred to a body which, according to Scotch traditions, was not antagonistic to general Scotch opinion. Moreover, in view of the disturbed state of some parts of Scotland, it would be most dangerous to

hand over the control of the police to purely popularly-elected bodies, though, hereafter, it might be possible to entrust these bodies with more important functions. As to the service franchise, he said the Government, while anxious to place the new system on the broadest possible basis, could not consent to place the entire control of the expenditure in the hands of those who did not contribute a shilling to the rates. Finally, he explained the principles on which the education rate would be distributed, the general result of which would be that voluntary and Board schools would be treated on exactly the same footing—that up to the Third Standard education would be free, and the ratepayers would receive a substantial relief. The debate, which occupied more or less of five sittings, brought out some marked differences of opinion as to the merits of the Bill. Among the representatives of Scotch constituencies some accepted it as an excellent measure, while others held that it would not meet the needs for which such a measure was required, or satisfy the expectations of the Scotch people. The chief objections taken to it, other than those raised by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, had reference to the non-inclusion of poor law control in the functions of the County Councils, to the limitations on free education, to the distribution of the Probate Duty—which it was contended was made in the interests of the land-owning classes—and to the constitution of the electorate. The Government were urged to extend free education to all the standards, and to consolidate the multitude of boards and public bodies now existing in the counties in one comprehensive authority. Sir George Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*) advocated one electorate for Parliament, for the County Council, and the Board of Guardians. Mr. Ritchie (*St. George's, E.*) and the Lord Advocate (*Bute*) defended the proposals of the Government, while, among members who advocated free education, Sir Lyon Playfair (*Leeds, S.*) appealed to the Government to make all the standards free, and thereby prevent what he believed would otherwise be a serious injury to the Scotch educational system. The Bill was read a second time (May 30), and referred to a committee of the whole House.

Among the miscellaneous business dealt with by the House of Commons, was a motion (May 24) by Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) for a Royal Commission to inquire into the existing penal system and the discipline in convict prisons. He gave numerous examples of what he regarded as excessive sentences, and advocated the constitution of a tribunal of judges to whom prisoners might appeal for a revision of the sentences inflicted upon them. The motion received a qualified support from Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*), but was resisted by Mr. Matthews (*Birmingham, E.*), who thought, however, that there might be a court for reviewing sentences. On a division, the motion was negatived by 122 to 53. An Irish debate on the Luggacurren evictions (May 27) was another of the casual matters that occupied

the House, while a more generally animated discussion occurred on the following day, when Mr. E. Robertson (*Dundee*) moved the reduction of the Foreign Office vote because of the withdrawal of the British Ambassador from Paris on the occasion of the opening of the French Exhibition. He charged the Government with acting in concert with European monarchies in offering an insult to the Government and people of France. Mr. Robertson was supported by Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*), who accused the Government of "cringing to every Pretender," and by Mr. J. Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*), who expressed his sympathy with the French Revolution, which the Exhibition commemorated. He declared that "the noyades, fusillades, guillotinings, and carnage that took place were entirely due to the interference of despots." Sir James Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) gave the official answer that this country ought not to express approval of the Revolution while that event was a subject of such fierce controversy in France; and this was repeated by Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*), who warmly denied any intention to offer an affront to the Republic. "It is our pride," he said, "to feel and our anxiety to maintain friendship for the French people." Mr. Gladstone's (*Midlothian*) speech was a curious one. He began by justifying his own Government in not answering the French invitation. Then he exempted Lord Salisbury from censure, as having a right to decide. Afterwards he took exception to Mr. Robertson's description of a constitutional and well-ordered State which we were bound to support, as a "miserable monarchy." Proceeding then to argue that "past" differences among the French did not signify, he held that to avoid attending the centenary of the French Revolution was as offensive as it would be for the French to avoid attending a celebration in honour of our own; and he supposed that the matter was only passed over by the French "because it excited their contempt." Finally, he pronounced the act of the Government to be one "of folly, though free from the taint of malice—an error of judgment of a very gross kind." The motion was negatived by 283 to 190.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Manchester, E.*) introduced in the House of Commons (May 31) five Bills intended to effect material improvements in that country—namely, four Drainage Bills and a Bill to facilitate the construction of light railways. Mr. T. Healy (*Longford, N.*) took a preliminary objection to the scheme being brought in as a whole, and the Speaker held that the Drainage Bills might be taken together, but that the Railway Bill must be treated separately. Mr. Balfour expressed regret at having thus to deal with his scheme piecemeal, and then proceeded to explain the Drainage Bills. He said they were intended to benefit tenants rather than landlords, and, as regarded the Bann, the Barrow, and the Shannon, were similar to the Bills of last year, except that the free grant in the case of the Shannon

had been increased by 15,000*l.* As to the Suck, the charge on the catchment area would be only 13,000*l.*, which would be met by a terminable annuity, payable by the tenants for 40 years, equivalent to the increase in the value of their holdings. There would be a free grant towards the scheme of 50,000*l.* from the Treasury, and the remainder of the expense would be paid by the owners of land, who would also have to bear the cost of maintenance for all time. The total charge for the Bills would be 383,000*l.* Mr. T. Healy (*Longford, N.*) gave a qualified support to the Bills, which he thought were well-intentioned, but he objected to the constitution of the Drainage Boards, which he said would not be sufficiently representative of the tenants. The Bills were criticised favourably by Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) and Colonel Nolan (*Galway, N.*), and in an opposite sense by Mr. Conybeare (*Camborne*) and Mr. Biggar (*Cavan, W.*), who respectively moved and seconded an amendment urging that the scheme should only be undertaken by and at the expense of a Home Rule Parliament. The debate stood adjourned, and on its resumption (June 3) Mr. Parnell (*Cork City*), though he offered no objection to the proposed expenditure, prophesied that no system of drainage would be successful in Ireland until Home Rule had been granted. After some discussion the amendment was withdrawn and the Bills were read a first time. Mr. Balfour then explained the measure for the construction of light railways, which, he said, consisted of two parts—the first containing amendments in matters of detail to the Act of 1883, and the second providing a new scheme for extending the railways through the congested districts of the West of Ireland. As regarded the latter, he remarked that under the Act of 1883 the Treasury only gave a guarantee subject to the guarantee of the barony; but the guarantee of the Treasury in the case of the new railways would be direct, and would consequently enable the promoters to raise the necessary capital at 3 per cent. instead of 5 per cent. as hitherto. The Treasury would be empowered to negotiate with the existing railways and provide the whole or any part of the capital for the proposed lines, and, failing agreement, they might make arrangements with other parties. In the latter case provision was made for a local guarantee to meet any deficiency caused by the working expenses exceeding the receipts; but the capital expenditure in either case would be provided by the Treasury independently of any local guarantee. Sir George Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*) and several other members expressed a general approval of the Bill, while Mr. Biggar (*Cavan, W.*) remarked that it was merely introduced to distract attention from the state of things in Ireland. The Bill was read a first time.

The second reading of the Board of Agriculture Bill was moved (June 3) by Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*), who explained that the Board would be established on the same principle as the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board. It would consist of

a President, who would be the Minister responsible to Parliament, and of such other persons as Her Majesty might from time to time think fit to appoint. The President, unless he received emolument in consequence of holding some other Ministerial appointment, would receive the same salary as the Presidents of the Board of Trade and the Local Government Board. The Board would take over the existing officers of the Privy Council Committee on Agriculture and the Land Commission, and the main object of the department, he remarked, would be to look after the interests of all persons connected with agriculture, including agricultural labourers as well as the property-owning classes. The Bill was received with mixed expressions of approval and doubt. Mr. Chaplin (*Sleaford*) objected to the constitution of the Board, and observed that there was no guarantee that it would consist of skilled agriculturists; Sir L. Playfair (*Leeds, S.*) was opposed to the inspection of schools of agriculture being transferred to the new department; and Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) objected to any addition being made to the salaried members of the Government in the House of Commons. The Bill was read a second time without a division.

Mr. Chaplin (*Sleaford*) obtained an opportunity in the House of Commons (June 4) for the discussion of the currency question, with special reference to his proposals for the revival of bimetallicism. He had previously (May 30), in conjunction with a large number of peers and members of Parliament, represented the views of the bimetallicists to Lord Salisbury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the Foreign Office. The Prime Minister regarded the question as one on which public opinion was not sufficiently formed, and Mr. Goschen also advised that it should be more fully discussed before any action was sought to be taken. The debate in the House of Commons was perhaps a step in that direction. Mr. Chaplin contended that the divergence in the value of the precious metals was prejudicial to the finances and the Government of India, and seriously added to the difficulties of trade between the United Kingdom and countries possessing a silver standard. The divergence, he said, was primarily due to the abandonment of the bimetallic system, to which he attributed also much of the recent depression in trade and agriculture. He advocated a conference with the chief commercial nations, such as Germany, the United States, and France and the other countries which comprise the Latin Union, for the purpose of considering whether and how far bimetallicism could be re-established; and in conclusion he moved a resolution affirming his views and urging the re-establishment of the bimetallic system. The mono-metallist view was upheld by Mr. J. Maclean (*Oldham*) and Sir J. Pease (*Barnard Castle*), the former of whom maintained that the natives, the Government, and the trade of India derived many advantages from the present system, while the latter held that the existing prosperity of trade in this country was an answer

to part of Mr. Chaplin's case. The debate was adjourned, but was not resumed during the Session. The House rose for the Whitsuntide recess (June 4).

Before the House of Lords adjourned for Whitsuntide, Lord Knutsford stated (June 3) that the Government had accepted the resignation of Sir Hercules Robinson as Governor of the Cape Colony. He said he had had an opportunity of hearing the views of Sir Hercules as regarded the important questions which had arisen in South Africa, but it was manifest that without deliberation Her Majesty's Government could not express a decision in accordance with those views, and give Sir Hercules the assurance he desired. Lord Knutsford paid a high tribute to the eminent public services of the late Governor of the Cape. Lord Carnarvon, who joined in this tribute, expressed his great regret that Her Majesty's Government had declined to give Sir Hercules Robinson that assurance without which he refused to resume the Governorship of the Cape. The noble lord regarded this as a mistake on the part of the Government, and as likely to render the position of the new Governor one of very great difficulty. The fear having been expressed that there had been a change of policy on the part of the Government, Lord Knutsford denied that this was the case, but the occasion, he said, was not a convenient one for the discussion of the general question.

The absence of important business in Parliament afforded leisure to the party leaders for political speeches outside. Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) was entertained (May 28) by the Liberal Union Club, and spoke of the invective adopted by Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues towards the Liberal Unionists as being the most complimentary attention that could be paid to them by the party of Home Rule. On the whole, however, he thought there was a lull in the excitement of politics. The wrath with which the Government had been threatened was not yet visible. "I think I may say," Mr. Goschen continued, "that that wave of popular opinion which was to sweep us all away has now assumed the pleasant and attractive form of a ripple of women's talk at the Grosvenor Gallery, where a soprano of women's cheers greeted the hand-shake between Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone." Referring to the issue of the next general election, Mr. Goschen observed that the other side were continually assuming that the election would terminate the existing state of things, and there were strong reasons why they should be most averse to anticipations of defeat. If the Unionists were beaten their policy would remain unaltered; but if the party of Home Rule were defeated their position would be absolutely disastrous. In this connection Mr. Goschen alluded to the terms in which Mr. Parnell had addressed the deputations from Irish Corporations a few days before (see page 119), and proceeded as follows:—"Take in the full force of that declaration. I thought that the Gladstonians said that time fights upon their side; but

Mr. Parnell declines an alliance with time. His point is this. 'I set a period to this Parliamentary attitude; it is an episode in the career of myself and my friends,' and our Gladstonian opponents during this episode, which they think must be eternal, take the hands and grasp the hands and embrace the men to whom all this is but a trial, but a Parliamentary trial which is a movement in which they will engage, but which they will abandon the moment they see that the electors of this country decide against them. Therefore the position is this: if a few electors in a certain number of constituencies in England and Scotland should turn the scale in favour of the Unionist cause, then Mr. Parnell threatens to abandon the whole of his Parliamentary attitude. 'I for one would not remain twenty-four hours longer in the House of Commons.' Yes, certainly that is a very pleasant position for him; it is consistent with the ante-Parliamentary period, and the post-Parliamentary period will probably be extremely like the ante-Parliamentary period. I do not know what methods will then be followed, or what new alliances will then be formed, but I want to put it to our Gladstonian opponents and to their constituencies what will be their position when, being in a minority in the House of Commons, Mr. Parnell and his party take up their bag and baggage and abandon the Parliamentary trial which they have for the moment endorsed. Will they then continue their alliance, or will they withdraw their expressions of sympathy if the party once more adopt a rebellious attitude? The future must decide. What I have shown you, I think, justifies me in the assertion that a defeat of the Gladstonian party at the poll does not mean to them what it would to us, but it means absolute ruin, it means an absolutely intolerable position, in which they would not only be the laughing-stock, but the scorn almost of every part of these realms. Then they will have once more to make up their minds whether they will continue the friends of those who may once more choose the paths of rebellion, or whether they will return to more constitutional ways."

Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, IV.*) addressed a Unionist meeting (May 28) at Bacup, the political centre of Lord Hartington's constituency, and devoted the greater part of his speech to the discussion of forms of local government, with a view to local self-government in Ireland. Bearing in mind a remark of Mr. Gladstone's, who had asserted that no scheme was entitled to a hearing which had not the approval of the Irish representatives, Mr. Chamberlain proceeded to quote declarations on the subject of Irish government by the more prominent Irish leaders. These all insisted more or less strongly on distinct nationality and independence for Ireland. For his own part, Mr. Chamberlain advocated the system of provincial self-government, an account of which he had lately published, and he stated that the scheme discussed at the Round Table Conference was one based on provincial lines. Sir W. Harcourt, he said, was then in favour of

such a scheme. "Now he says," Mr. Chamberlain added, "the nationality of Ireland must be recognised, and he accuses me of inconsistency." In a vigorous passage of self-vindication, with which he concluded his address, Mr. Chamberlain spoke as follows:—"In spite of Sir William Harcourt I can point to my record, which I think is better than his. I say I am still the Liberal and the Radical I was when Sir William Harcourt was thinking of joining the Tory Government under Disraeli. I was still a Liberal and a Radical when Sir William Harcourt was boasting in the country that he was the true successor of the Whigs, and I shall remain a Liberal and a Radical through all the changes through which Sir William Harcourt has yet to pass. Though I be Liberal and Radical, I like half a loaf better than no bread. If I cannot get disestablishment, I am very thankful to have local government, and to see my fellow-citizens admitted to their part and share in local administration. If I cannot get the management of universal education by freely elected School Boards, none the less on that account do I desire to have free education, and none the less willing am I to accept it, even from the hands of a Conservative Government. If I think local veto is extreme, I am prepared to ask for Sunday closing; and if I do not think that all the ills to which the crofter and the labourers are subjected can be removed by the stroke of a pen, I am glad to recognise the sympathy which this Government has shown for the poor, and none the less am I willing to express my belief that they will do something to root the agricultural labourer in the soil he tills, and to relieve the crofter proprietors of the West of Scotland from at least the greatest of grievances under which they labour. These things, I say, are feasible and possible so long as the Unionist alliance continues, and I am not going to throw them away because Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Morley, who have never done anything to assist these proposals, are pleased to say that I have become a Tory because I will not assist them in their conspiracy to break up the United Kingdom."

A large deputation of peers and members of Parliament interested in Irish affairs waited upon Lord Salisbury (May 29), at his residence in Arlington Street, to present a memorial urging that the time had arrived when the office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland might be abolished with advantage to the true interests of the United Kingdom. The reasons for pressing the matter upon the Prime Minister's consideration were stated in the memorial as follows:—

"1. The existence of the Viceroyalty encourages the idea that the complete union between Great Britain and Ireland has not taken place.

"2. The circumstance that the Lord-Lieutenant is not, like a colonial Governor, above the strife of party, but is obliged to assume the double position of official representative of the Sove-

reign and member of the Irish Executive Government, places the holders of the office in an anomalous position.

"3. The saving of money effected by the abolition of the Viceroyalty could be employed for the purpose of maintaining a Royal residence in Ireland.

"4. The discontinuance of the Viceroyalty, and the transfer of the Executive duties now performed by the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary to a Secretary of State and a Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Ireland, would assimilate the administration of Ireland with that of the rest of the United Kingdom.

"It should be remembered that the Act of Union makes no reference to the existence or maintenance of the Lord Lieutenancy; that during the first half of the present century the opinion of the most distinguished statesmen of the age was expressed in favour of its abolition; and that when, in 1850, Lord John Russell introduced his Bill to effect the change, it passed the second reading in the House of Commons by a majority of 225 votes (395—170)."

In his reply, Lord Salisbury stated that before such a change could be made as the deputation desired legislation would be necessary, and that was at present impracticable. Meanwhile the working of the Viceroyalty must be carried on, and Lord Zetland had consented to act as successor to Lord Londonderry.

CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Gladstone's Campaign in Devonshire and Cornwall—Mr. Balfour at Portsmouth—"How to make a Separatist Agitator"—Bye-Elections—Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill—Scotch Universities and Local Government Bills—Army Estimates—Mr. Balfour's Reply to Mr. Gladstone—Board of Agriculture Bill—Irish Drainage Bills—Labour Conference at Berne—Crete—Delagoa Bay Railway—Land Transfer Bill—Alleged Outrages in Armenia—Mr. Goschen at Hanley—Lord Derby on Federal Home Rule—The Oliphert Evictions—Presentation to Mr. W. H. Smith—The Freedom of Cardiff and Mr. Gladstone—Royal Grants Debates—Prince of Wales's Children Bill—Mr. Goschen on Disloyalty to Mr. Gladstone—Lord Hartington at City Liberal Club—Mr. Parnell and the Freedom of Edinburgh—The Tithes Bill—Light Railways Bill—Civil Service Estimates—Sir W. Harcourt at Hereford—Mr. Balfour's Reply to Mr. Parnell—Mr. Gladstone's Golden Wedding—Lord Randolph Churchill in the Midlands—Ministers at the Mansion House—Mr. Chamberlain on the New Radicals—The Indian Budget—Catholic Education in Ireland—Imperial Federation—Visit of the German Emperor—Mr. Chamberlain on Lord Randolph Churchill.

WITH a courage perhaps unequalled in the history of political campaigning, Mr. Gladstone devoted the Whitsuntide recess to a tour in the South-west of England, extending over nearly a fortnight, and including a speech for nearly every day, and for some days two and even three speeches. The courage consisted not only in the physical effort which such a campaign demanded, but also in the fact that the district which Mr. Gladstone visited was the enemy's ground. He determined to carry his flag into

Unionist constituencies, and especially to challenge the Liberal Unionist forces within their own lines. Leaving London on Derby Day (June 5), accompanied by Sir William Harcourt, whose guest he was to be at Malwood until the following Saturday, Mr. Gladstone's first stopping place was Southampton. In the grounds of the Deanery there he received a large number of addresses, and spoke to ten or twelve thousand persons. His first observations, naturally, had reference to the Liberal victory obtained at the bye-election of Southampton by Mr. Evans. Proceeding from this subject by an equally natural sequence, Mr. Gladstone referred to the bye-elections generally. He claimed that out of sixty-seven seats contested since the General Election, his own party had won ten, a result from which he concluded that among the 670 seats eventually to be filled they would win 60. He was, of course, reminded by the critics of his speech that in this reckoning he was rashly assuming, among other things, that the large number of uncontested Unionist seats would all go over to his side.

After a day's rest at Malwood, Mr. Gladstone drove to Romsey (June 7) to receive an address from the corporation, before the presentation of which he lunched at Broadlands—Lord Palmerston's old residence—with Mr. Evelyn Ashley. The address was presented, and Mr. Gladstone's reply was made, in the open air, during a heavy fall of rain. Mr. Gladstone made no reference to disputed political questions, but he paid a cordial tribute to Lord Palmerston, of whom he said that "no man did more for the purpose of aiding in the achievement of one of the greatest and purest triumphs of the eighteenth century—I mean in the abolition of slavery and the slave trade; and I know not whether any man did more in propagating the idea and the sympathy—if I might say so, almost the contagion—in British principles of liberty, of constitutional liberty, associated with order, and forming the best basis of order, throughout the Continent of Europe." Speaking at Weymouth on the following day (June 8) Mr. Gladstone returned to political subjects. He corrected an error in his Southampton speech, in reference to the Liberal gains in the bye-elections. The number of seats gained should have been stated, he said, as nine, and not ten. In an address presented to him prominence was given to the question of shorter Parliaments, and Mr. Gladstone, turning to this topic, held that four or five years was a sufficient term for a Parliament to run. He admitted, however, that he did not wish to see Parliamentary terms made too short, because the country would then always be in the ferment of elections. A personal reference to himself in another address drew from Mr. Gladstone the remark that they should "not be too fond of encouraging men to stay too long" in their service. "They may come to be," he added, "like public singers who begin to sing flat, and who never know when they begin to sing flat."

After going into some details to show the vast changes for the better in Ireland which had occurred during his own recollection, and attributing these changes to considerate legislation, Mr. Gladstone proceeded:—"No, it is the acts which Parliament has done which have tended to reduce the range of crime in Ireland, and not these acts alone, but it is what is now going on. The members returned by the people of Ireland under the shelter of secret voting—these members have exerted themselves with laudable and untiring persistency to condemn, thwart, and put down by every means in their power, crime and outrage in Ireland. The reward they have received is that out of eighty-five representatives twenty-three or twenty-five have been put in prison by the Government." Pursuing the same subject Mr. Gladstone observed:—"When the foreigner wants to attack an Englishman, to show up the hollowness of his professions, to denounce him as one who recommends liberty for others but is not fond of applying it in his own case, Ireland is the case that is always quoted. It is a matter of course; it is a commonplace of controversy and remark. Sometimes it is coupled with Poland. We are told sometimes the case of Poland and the case of Ireland are the two cases most disgraceful to Europe. This is very pleasant for you, is it not, to find you are obliged to look to a country of despotic institutions and to a country which, though a very great country, has never had your political education, to a country in which as yet nobody professes the principles of freedom, and, forsooth, it is in that country the European citizen is obliged to look for a parallel of the conduct and policy which England pursues towards Ireland."

Speaking at Torquay (June 10), Mr. Gladstone repeated his familiar argument against the Crimes Act, that it was not directed against crime but against combination. "The Act which I must say shamelessly calls itself the Crimes Act," he observed, "is no Crimes Act at all. Crime is punished in Ireland, but it is punished by virtue of the ordinary law. The Act called the Crimes Act was never intended to punish crime. It was intended to prevent the poorer occupiers of Ireland from availing themselves of the only means of doing themselves justice in those cases where they were tyrannically or oppressively used by their landlords, and to prevent them from so doing themselves justice by the only means—namely, the means of peaceful combination among themselves, means of combination which are so freely used by Tory power whenever the opportunity is given."

Mr. Gladstone continued:—"When in respect to Ireland the Union was projected, and when by a series of transactions that I will not now describe we were called upon to take over her nationality and her traditions, when we were asked to hand over the entire management of her concerns to a Parliament in which they were to constitute a minority numerically very small, and certainly with an influence even smaller in proportion to the total

number, the answer uniformly made was this:—‘You forget that we are now going to accord by a great and solemn Act the principle of equal laws over the three countries. England is the freest country in Europe. You are called upon to enter into her inheritance; you are called upon to enjoy this perfect parity and brotherhood, whose efficacy for protecting the rights and promoting the happiness of the people has been proved by the experience of so many generations.’ That pledge of equal laws was a solemn pledge, was a fundamental condition, as declared by the friends of the Union, of that so-called compact. It was the great compensation to Ireland for the sacrifice it was required to make. It was the consideration which they were asked to recognise as being a sufficient price for all that they were to surrender. Where are those equal laws now? In almost every year since the Union coercive measures have been enforced. Unquestionably on many occasions social causes disturbed the condition of the country, rendering those coercive measures a temporary necessity; but what was recognised in former years, aye, even by the unreformed Parliament of this country, as only tolerable by way of providing for the temporary necessity, has now been adopted as a permanent law, as a portion of the jurisprudence of the country, meted out to Ireland as being the only means of providing for the social wants of the land in regard to which we had uttered this solemn promise of perfect equality. Crimes constituted in Ireland out of actions which are free and lawful, and even on many occasions necessary, in England, exceptional laws devised with the smallest pretext of an exceptional need, and those exceptional laws erected into policy and principle instead of being reluctantly passed as temporary remedies for temporary evils—these are the records, gentlemen, which our opponents have presented to the country, and upon the basis of those records they will ask, when the time comes they will ask, and ask in vain, for a renewal of the confidence which they have abused.”

Of the Plan of Campaign Mr. Gladstone remarked in the same speech that its “true authors were those who made the Plan of Campaign a necessity—namely, those who now constitute the majority of the House of Commons.” After reviewing the general legislation of 1888 Mr. Gladstone went on to speak of the Special Commission Act. Premising that he would avoid any reference to the proceedings of the Commission, he said:—“In the first place, you are aware that the personal honour of Mr. Parnell was called in question by charges connected with certain letters which would have proved him to be an unworthy member of any civilised or any human society. The House of Commons has always been in the habit of regarding the personal character of its members in all matters bearing on their Parliamentary duty as demanding its anxious care, and the instances are numerous in which, when that personal character has been called in question

in matters connected with their public duty and bearing upon their capacity to perform it, the House of Commons has taken the investigation of the subject into its own hands and has disposed of it by the appointment of its own Committees. That was what the House of Commons was asked to do upon the present occasion. Had the House of Commons assented to that fair and legitimate petition, supported as it was by the tradition of former precedents, a very few weeks and probably the expenditure of a very few hundreds of pounds would have sufficed to bring to light the astounding facts connected with what are now universally called the forged letters. The whole of that great controversy would practically have been disposed of. What course was taken? The request was refused. The usual majorities of the Tories, supported by the Dissident Liberals to a man, declined to afford Mr. Parnell access to the tribunal which he anxiously solicited. And yet, bear this in mind, he was not soliciting access to a tribunal prejudiced in his own behalf. He knew very well, and I knew when I made the motion, that, as a matter of course, when we came to the selection of the Committee it must be composed in the major part of Tories and Dissident Liberals. It would have had a majority of the political opponents of Mr. Parnell to deal with the matters that were to be committed to it. But we were not afraid on the subject of Mr. Parnell's honour. We, the Liberals, were not afraid, and Mr. Parnell on his own behalf was not afraid, to appeal to a tribunal which was constitutional, which was simple, which would have gone straight to the point, and which at the same time, if it had prejudices at all, must have had prejudices in the direction opposite to that of his interests. But the course taken was this—the Government came to the House of Commons after the Committee had been refused—the Government came to the House and said, 'We are willing to grant to Mr. Parnell the appointment of a Parliamentary Commission to inquire into the charges connected with the forged letters and the other charges which have been made against the Irish members if he desires it.' Mr. Parnell required, in the first place, to know what this tribunal was to be and what it was to inquire into, and when this was made known it was also made known by Mr. Parnell and by his friends that they did not desire it. We, the Liberal party, considered it to be most dangerous in its character as a precedent, most burdensome, and tending almost certainly to boundless expense. For, gentlemen, the expense of that tribunal will not be in hundreds, will not be in thousands, will not be in tens of thousands, but will be in hundreds of thousands. We objected to this, but the majority in the House of Commons, having got a scent of blood, having a belief that some of those charges would probably be proved and thinking, I have no doubt conscientiously, that the proof of that would be a great public good, they converted the pledge made on a voluntary offer into a compulsory proceeding and carried a Bill

for the appointment of the Parnell Commission at every stage against our resolute opposition."

At Redruth and Falmouth, on the following day (June 11), Mr. Gladstone spoke chiefly upon Irish topics. At Falmouth he remarked that the Government appeared to wish to "apply to the Irish nation principles of government which are hardly fit to be applied in a menagerie to the taming of wild animals." At Redruth, where he was accompanied by Mr. Conybeare, he took occasion to praise that honourable member as "a brave, an honest, an upright man." On the next day (June 12), Mr. Gladstone spoke at Truro, St. Austell and Bodmin. At Truro he maintained that, though the Catholics of Ireland might be in some danger of persecution from the Orangemen of Ulster, the Orangemen were absolutely safe from persecution at the hands of the Catholics. He rested his case partly on the historical fact that, in the time of Roman Catholic persecution in England, English Protestants took refuge in Ireland, where the Catholics gave them shelter, and partly on the willingness of the Irish Catholics to follow Protestant leaders like Grattan, Curran, Mr. Butt, and Mr. Parnell. At St. Austell Mr. Gladstone made a short but pointed allusion to the new phase of the Home Rule movement—the attempts towards Federal Home Rule—in the following words:—"There is a great subject coming forward which requires, and eminently requires, the application of a Liberal spirit and of Liberal principles. You are aware that Welshmen, and also Scotchmen, are beginning to think, have begun to think, that something is due to the principle of nationality among them as well as among the Irish people. That, gentlemen, is perfectly true, and it is to you that the times have to look for a clear, equitable settlement of that principle. They do not mean anything adverse to the unity of the Empire. No one would dare to bring an accusation so preposterous against our Welsh or Scotch fellow-subjects. That is reserved for our Irish fellow-subjects, upon whom so many of our fellow-countrymen have too long been accustomed to trample; but it is the Liberal party that will have to consider in the course of its proceedings what subjects they are that ought to be dwelt upon, not only with regard to what England thinks, but what Scotland thinks on Scotch matters and what Wales may think on Welsh matters."

In the same speech Mr. Gladstone dealt with the whole question of Disestablishment; first, as regards England, and next in reference to Scotland and Wales. On the first branch of the subject he said:—"Now I am going to fulfil my promise—and the fulfilment of that promise will, as usual, entail a burden on you—the promise was that I would refer to the subject of Disestablishment which you have mentioned in this address, and which naturally possesses a special interest and attraction in a county inhabited very largely by conscientious Nonconformists."

You have in one sense given me more credit than I deserved. You say that I am entitled to the credit of having introduced Disestablishment into the programme of the Liberal party. Well, now, Disestablishment is both a vast and a varied subject. So far as England is concerned I apprehend there are few of you who think that a legislative settlement of that question is very near at hand. It is a subject of the deepest complexity and attended with the greatest possible differences of opinion. I do not think that the most sanguine among you would presume to say that there has yet been in England a distinct pronouncement of the national voice upon the subject of Disestablishment. You see, or you believe you see, a movement of opinion in that direction, and I believe that you are wisely content to watch those results which are achieved in this country when the due season has arrived. Naturally at my time of life such a subject is placed beyond all possibility—all reasonable possibility—of contact with myself. If it ever comes it will come to a prepared people; it will come without the bitterness which, unfortunately, has too much marked our recent conflicts on the subject of Irish privileges. It will come, I think, to the great religious community which will have learned before that time to disavow all selfish dependence upon the temporal and secular arm, which will know that the establishment is one thing and that the Church is another thing, and which will have ample means undoubtedly, if the spirit be not wanting to provide, to fill up whatever void might be caused by the withdrawal of the support from national property which the Church may now be considered to receive."

In regard to the question of Disestablishment in Scotland, Mr. Gladstone claimed Lord Hartington for his leader. Lord Hartington had observed, he said, that this was "a question which ought to be settled according to the sense of the people of Scotland." That was also his, Mr. Gladstone's, opinion, and he was prepared to extend it to Welsh Disestablishment, in relation to the people of Wales.

Touching Welsh Disestablishment Mr. Gladstone made the following personal explanation:—"Now, gentlemen, some of my friends in Wales, when they saw the list of the division on Welsh Disestablishment the other day, and saw that my name was not on it, perhaps not unnaturally thought that I had done that which is sometimes found by some portion of the House of Commons to be a convenience—namely, to shirk giving a vote upon a question. It was not possible for me, gentlemen, to take any such course. It has never been my Parliamentary practice to avoid a difficulty by declining to give an opinion. It was, in my opinion, my absolute duty to do these two things—first of all, to wait for a full, undoubted, and I will even say repeated declaration that there might be no question at all upon the subject; and, secondly, to pursue the same course with regard to Scotland and to Wales. I had, therefore, allowed the question of

Scotch Disestablishment to go to a division twice in separate Sessions of Parliament before taking any part upon it myself. Having witnessed that double result I confess that I am of opinion that the time has come when the sense of Scotland has been sufficiently and unequivocally declared. I did the very same thing in regard to Wales. Once there had been a division on Welsh Disestablishment before I declared at Nottingham my strong opinion that the Liberal party ought to have these questions settled according to the convictions of the respective countries, and I thought it my absolute duty to Scotland, as well as to the country at large, that I should lay down for myself the very same condition in respect to Wales, and, as I had required a double declaration, with a reasonable interval of time between, before I could say that Scotland had spoken unequivocally upon Scotch Disestablishment, so I should wait for the second occasion of a Welsh vote before I should say that Wales had spoken on the subject of Disestablishment in Wales. I am sure, gentlemen, you will understand that this was no more than the duty of a person holding the position that I had the honour to hold in Parliament, whose vote never can be considered as a merely personal vote, but whose vote always assumes more or less the character of an appeal to all those whose general confidence he may have the happiness to possess to vote as he has done. You will understand, then, that the condition which I laid down was this full and unequivocal evidence of the two countries. Having that full and unequivocal evidence before me, when the question is brought forward again with respect to the one country or the other I shall be ready to render a distinct account of my opinions. I shall not flinch from entering into the division lobby, and from what I have said you may be able to form a conjecture of what my vote may be. But, at any rate, that will be the course which I shall take, and I shall feel that in taking that course I have done all that I can to secure for Scotland and for Wales the privilege of exercising a determining influence upon what is so important to their feelings and to their condition, and of saving them from the danger in which they might otherwise stand of being overborne by an English majority rushing upon them and deciding these Welsh and Scotch matters according to a possible balance of English opinion in a directly opposite sense."

At Tintagel and Launceston (June 13 and 14) Mr. Gladstone eschewed contentious topics, though at the latter place he indulged in a little satire at the expense of the Liberal Unionists. "Have you observed," he asked, "that the Tories, speaking generally, have said very little about the Irish question? They have left it to the Dissident Liberals to do the work for them. The Dissident Liberals have developed an enormous faculty of eloquence all over the Kingdom. They are always at it; there is not a week, there is hardly a day, that you

do not see Lord Hartington here, Mr. Chamberlain there, or some other distinguished man of their party explaining their views. That is a testimony, not of vanity or egotism, but of the tenacity of their disposition to refuse justice to Ireland. The Tories, I am very much disposed to believe, might very probably have listened to the call of Ireland by this time, if it were not for the Dissident Liberals. But they know that the moment they show the slightest disposition to concede what Ireland demands, that moment the Dissident Liberals abandon them, and they go out of office."

From Launceston Mr. Gladstone went on to Plymouth, where he made (June 14) one of the most important speeches of his Western campaign. Referring to an observation made by the chairman of the meeting (Sir Thomas Dyke Acland), to the effect that the Home Rule movement was not undertaken "as a matter of party computation and with a view to office," Mr. Gladstone said:—"Happily, the evidence of that fact is before the world, because it is known to the public, through authentic documents, that when Lord Salisbury was in office in the winter of 1885 I made known my readiness and desire, in case he were disposed to confer this boon on Ireland and the country, to render him, in the position that I then occupied of independent opposition, the best assistance in my power." And why did I do that? Because I believed it was the shortest and simplest way to the settlement of the question. I knew that if the proposal were made by Tories, for whatever reason, it would be supported by Liberals on its merits. But I knew also that if the proposal were made by Liberals occupying the seat of power, it would meet from their opponents with a very different reception. But this is a matter of secondary consequence. Only let me point out to you—and I think that the ground is a very clear one—that I have ever felt that this question had a special hold and a special claim upon myself. At earlier periods of my life, from no merit, no deep-laid plan of mine, it has happened to me in more than one important case to make myself the advocate of oppressed populations both in Italy and in the East. That duty I will not say had been sought for by myself, for it would be assuming a merit that I have no claim to; but that duty became incumbent upon me and I have discharged it to the best of my power. But the law of truth, of justice, and of freedom, which makes us the advocates of the oppressed and the opponents of the oppressor in foreign lands, applies in full force to our own land, nor can I conceive anything more unsound—I will go further and say anything more contemptible—than the attitude either of the nation or of the man who abounds in humanity and justice when it is a question of practising it abroad, but who can shut his eyes and wink at mischief and refuse this poor service of the cause of right when the question is at home, and when those who are to be charged with that injustice are his own fellow-countrymen and the rulers of this great nation."

Mr. Gladstone then adduced, in an elaborate argument, several reasons why Home Rule should be conceded to Ireland. Briefly stated, these were that Home Rule has been repeatedly and constitutionally demanded by the Irish people; that the concession would be in keeping with the traditions of the Liberal party—a point which Mr. Gladstone enforced by the remark that every man who was entitled to the character of a Liberal leader at the period of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland was an opponent of that Union; that Ireland had a right to be dissatisfied with her present position; and that Home Rule would be the means, not of leading to separation, but of preventing it. This last point he illustrated by historical allusions to the experience of other countries. “I for one am most thankful,” Mr. Gladstone observed, “that the Irish nation, evincing a wisdom and a moderation that I should have wished to see imitated by their opponents, have never asked for the repeal of the Union. They see that constitutional difficulties or serious practical difficulties might be raised were that demand to be made, and they have therefore absolutely refrained from it. Though O’Connell, whom in other days I have heard called a patriot by Mr. Balfour, and I rather commend Mr. Balfour for that act of historical liberality, although O’Connell sought the repeal of the Union, the Nationalist party of Ireland, who are now in a condition to say that they represent the nation because they are the constitutional organ of the nation, returned to Parliament to represent them, that party has waived that demand. I am most thankful for it, because although I have always said I was not personally prepared to face or to undertake the repeal of the Act of Union, yet I am bound to say this—that Act of Union was a pretended compact to which the Irish nation never gave its consent. I will not enter now into all the proceedings connected with the passing of the Act, in which were all the fraud, all the bribery, all the torture, all the slaughter, all the scandalous and incredible acts which at that time stained the character both of the British Government and all those who represented them in Ireland; but I will simply say this—that never, either at that time or since, had the Act of Union that sanction which, considering it is a compact between two countries, was absolutely necessary in order to give it moral force, and therefore I can the better appreciate on the one hand the strong title which the Irish have to call for change, and on the other hand the moderation with which they have restricted their demands within limits considerably narrower than those to which, if they looked to logic or history only, they might have been entitled to push them.” The speech was concluded by the following eloquent passage:—“You have done a good deal for Ireland. You established religious equality; you mitigated the land laws; you gave the power of secret voting; you, too, conferred on Ireland a franchise as large as your own. Ireland is grateful for all these things, but she beseeches you likewise to

give her a legislative organ which shall be associated with herself in unity of feeling for every Irish purpose, while she is willing either to leave to you or to concur with you in the provision necessary to be made for every Imperial interest. Give her Home Rule for her own sake, but give it also for yours. Rely upon it that the benefits of that measure will pour in a golden flood throughout the country. It will raise the country, it will unite the country, and it will strengthen the country. It will enrich the country, for new and better relations in Ireland will lead, as I have said, to the greater development of industrial power. All these will be great benefits to us, but there is one benefit greater still and which touches us nearer the heart. When you have attained this blessed end you will then have done more than merely strengthening and enriching the country. You will have redeemed her character from the reproach of ages, for although there are some Englishmen who do not like to hear it, yet it is a fact palpable as the sun at noonday that the condition of Ireland, and the total failure to bring her into harmony with the general system of this vast Empire, is and has been the reproach of England for centuries in all the countries of the civilized world. We hope to redeem her character from the reproach, and if we are enabled so to do we shall confer upon her the greatest and the noblest benefit of all."

This address at Plymouth was practically the conclusion of the remarkable series of speeches to which Mr. Gladstone had given the whole of the Whitsuntide recess. At every subsequent stage in his progress—at Poole, at Wimborne, and at Blandford (June 15), at Shaftesbury and Gillingham (June 17)—he received addresses and spoke in reply to them at greater or less length, but these were unimportant speeches to which it is unnecessary to make any reference. He returned to London (June 17) on the thirteenth day from that of his setting out, unimpaired in vigour either by the fatigues of continued travelling, or by the ordinarily more exhausting fatigue of much speaking.

By a singular piece of good fortune Mr. Gladstone had the whole field to himself after the first day of his tour of speeches. On that day, however (June 5), Mr. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) was his rival. While Mr. Gladstone was receiving ovations at Southampton, the Chief Secretary was undergoing a similar experience at Portsmouth, where, in the evening, he addressed a large public assembly. His speech, which was wholly devoted to Irish topics, contained the following noteworthy passage:—"I should like to give lectures teaching any aspirant to fame how to be a Separatist agitator. I have made careful study of the whole subject, and I have seen a good deal of it; a good many of the arts have been practised upon myself, and I think I know as much about the subject as anybody. I should say, in the first place, to such a person:—Never argue, because an argument can be answered. Never develop your plan for Home Rule,

because painful experience has shown that no plan of Home Rule has ever yet been devised by the most ingenious brain which could not be knocked to pieces in twenty minutes by the least expert of political pugilists. Starve your memory—it is a most inconvenient gift—and cultivate your imagination, for it is the most valuable of all qualities. When you are speaking in England and to an English audience melt them into tears by a picture of the woe and poverty of the Irish tenant. When you are in Ireland do all you can to destroy the confidence which is the only solid basis of industrial development. And no doubt you should accept any money which may be given to you from the English Exchequer, but absolutely decline to lend yourself to any such vulgar and commonplace procedure as establishing the condition of law and order which will do more than any number of millions lavished from the wealthiest Exchequer in the world. When you are speaking in England talk about the union of hearts, and when you are in Ireland praise the memory of the rebels of '98, or the rebels of '48, or the rebels of '68, or the Manchester murderers. When you are in England discourse upon the brutality of landlords who turn out their tenants, and on the hardness of agents who will not give abatements of rent. When you are in Ireland take care that no offer, however reasonable, shall be accepted by any tenant. Turn them out of their holdings, compel them to adopt the Plan of Campaign, deprive them by your procedure of the whole of the improvements which they have made on their farms, and then support them in pauperism and beggary out of the funds of the Land League. Invent for yourselves, if you have sufficient ingenuity, or, if that be too much trouble, take from the pages of *United Ireland* any number of falsehoods and fictions with regard to the action of the Government and the police in that country. Lavish imaginary details about little girls and old women who are put in prison, about old men who are knocked down for intimidating the police, about persons who are put in prison for cheering Mr. Gladstone or booing Mr. Balfour. When one lie has been exposed go to another. When one story has been utterly exposed there is nothing to prevent your exercising the same great gifts in the creation of a new one. When it has been conclusively shown that Mr. Mandeville was not murdered by the Chief Secretary, then make out that Mr. O'Brien is being murdered by the Chief Secretary. When it has been shown that Mr. O'Brien, on his own testimony and on the sworn testimony of everybody concerned, has not been treated with more force than was absolutely necessary to carry out the rules of the prison, make no apology, do not allude to the question, but invent some new fiction which will be equally attractive. Then when you have done all this, and when you have learnt the art of seasoning the whole dish with a kind of sickly sentimentality as far removed from true humanity as the south is from the north, then you will be quali-

fied, and amply qualified, to join the great band of Separatist orators, and to shatter the Constitution in the name of freedom, and to destroy the law in the name of liberty."

No bye-election occurred after the middle of April, until June 3, when Mr. John Morrogh was returned without opposition for South-East Cork, in place of Alderman Hooper, who had resigned. The local Nationalists appear to have accepted Mr. Morrogh's nomination without question, notwithstanding that he was personally unknown to them. But his liberal donation of 1,000*l.* to the Parnell Indemnity Fund was no doubt a sufficient proof of his fitness to occupy a Nationalist seat. In July there were no fewer than four elections to fill Parliamentary vacancies. Mr. Augustine Birrell—the accomplished author of "*Obiter Dicta*"—was returned for West Fife (July 5) as a Gladstonian, by a majority of 793 over his Liberal-Unionist opponent. Mr. Birrell's election did not alter the political representation of the constituency, and as there had been no previous contest since the re-division of the county, no comparison with former elections could be made. Mr. G. Wyndham, Mr. A. J. Balfour's private secretary, was returned unopposed for Dover (July 12), where a vacancy had been caused by the death of Major Dickson. It is perhaps remarkable that a candidate standing in so close a relationship to the Irish Secretary should have been allowed to enter Parliament unchallenged. The Home Rule section of the Liberal party, however, reserved their strength for the contest in East Marylebone (July 19), where Mr. George Leveson-Gower was the Gladstonian candidate for the seat vacated by Lord Charles Beresford. Here, though they did not secure the seat, they reduced an adverse majority of 1,485 into one of 493. But the Conservatives had, two days previously (July 17), scored a similar "moral victory" in West Carmarthenshire, where the Gladstonian majority was brought down from 2,265 to 1,719.

On the House of Commons reassembling (June 17), members were promptly made to realise that the remainder of the Session must be given to continuous work. Mr. Smith (*Strand*) claimed to take for Government business all the Tuesday sittings, while he offered some consolation to the House by announcing that the Sugar Bounties Bill would not be proceeded with, and that all the important measures which the Government desired to pass had been laid before Parliament. The motion for appropriating the Tuesdays was met by an amendment deferring its operation for four weeks, but the amendment was negatived by a large majority, and the motion was agreed to. The House then discussed the Army Estimates in Committee of Supply. On a question being raised as to the office of the Judge Advocate-General, Mr. E. Stanhope (*Lincolnshire, S.*) explained that no change had been made in the office, except that its duties were being performed by Sir W. Marriott without salary, pending a rearrangement of the department. Mr. Labouchere (*North*

ampton) moved the rejection of the vote for the Yeomanry, on the ground that that force was merely ornamental without being useful, but the vote was carried by 132 to 50. On the vote for the Volunteers, Mr. Stanhope was pressed by several members to increase the efficiency of this branch of the auxiliary service, and he expressed the sympathy of the War Office with the desire to make the Volunteers as effective a force as possible. On the following day (June 18), attention was drawn to the bad and deficient barrack accommodation in various places. Mr. Stanhope said he had a scheme dealing with the whole matter, but he feared it would have to be postponed to the next year. In the case of the worst barracks, however, and especially those in Dublin, he hoped to be able to do something during the Session. The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, with which no progress had been made since its second reading early in April, was considered in Committee (June 19). An amendment to Clause 1, moved by the Attorney-General (*Isle of Wight*), providing that persons who ill-treated or neglected children should be guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to punishment by fine or imprisonment, was agreed to. The Bill was the subject of animated discussion at further sittings of the House in Committee. Considerable feeling was aroused by an amendment, moved by the Attorney-General, excepting from the prohibition against the employment of children under ten years of age, children performing in a licensed place of public entertainment. The amendment was supported by Mr. Mundella (*Sheffield, Brightside*), but it was warmly opposed, and on a division was negatived by 129 to 80. On the Bill being reported to the House (July 10), Mr. Jennings moved an amendment in a like sense, but limited to theatres. After a long discussion this amendment, like that of the Attorney-General, was rejected by a majority of forty-nine, though the numbers voting were much larger than on the former occasion. The Bill was read a third time and passed on July 12.

One of the chief measures of the Session, the Universities (Scotland) Bill, came up for second reading in the House of Commons (June 20). The Lord Advocate (*Buteshire*), in moving the second reading, explained that the Bill provided for the appointment of an executive committee, to whom the subject of theological tests would be submitted to ascertain to what extent they could be dealt with. The sum of 42,000*l.* would, he said, be charged on the Consolidated Fund in lieu of the Government grant. In other respects the Bill carried out the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1876. The Bill was freely criticised by many members. Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) complained that the proposed grant would be inadequate, and he thought there was no need for referring the question of religious tests to a committee. Mr. Craig-Sellar (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) said that the measure was an attempt to carry on University

Education "on the cheap." Mr. Wallace (*Edinburgh, E.*) objected to the retention of religious tests, and described the motion to refer them to a committee as a "ludicrous superfluity." Sir Lyon Playfair (*Leeds, S.*) insisted on the necessity for a larger expenditure than the Government contemplated. Some other members gave a general approval to the Bill, which was read a second time without a division. At a morning sitting (June 21), chiefly devoted to the Army Estimates, Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) took exception to some public declarations of Lord Wolseley in favour of a system of conscription—a subject in regard to which Mr. E. Stanhope (*Lincolnshire, S.*) said the Government had no sympathy with the views attributed to Lord Wolseley—and Mr. Labouchere moved a reduction of the Commander-in-Chief's salary, on the ground that his Royal Highness received more than double what was considered an adequate sum for Field Marshal Von Moltke. The motion was negatived by 211 to 108. On the question of Supply at the evening sitting, Mr. J. Ellis (*Leicestershire, W.*) called attention to the recent and impending evictions in Ireland, and moved a resolution urging that steps should be taken to provide for arbitration in cases of dispute between landlords and tenants. Mr. Smith-Barry (*Huntingdon, S.*) defended the action of Mr. Ponsonby, to the evictions on whose estate reference had been made, and who had insisted, he said, that the rents should be fixed by a properly constituted legal tribunal, and not by an illegal conspiracy. Mr. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) stated that evictions were not at present appearing in an acute form, and that almost all the difficulties had occurred on Plan of Campaign estates.

As President for the year of the Constitutional Union, Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) presided at the annual dinner of that body (June 19), and replied to the toast of "The Constitutional Cause." His speech was for the most part a reply to Mr. Gladstone's recent speeches, and especially to the address at Plymouth. Referring to Mr. Gladstone's historical defence of the principle of Home Rule, Mr. Balfour said he would rather that Mr. Gladstone should occupy himself in making false deductions from the history of the past than that he should make false history of the present time. He proceeded to say:—"Mr. Gladstone started a thesis that the political experience of the world proved that Home Rule, or a modification of Home Rule, was a success. I would remind you that every great nation of which we have any authentic account has become great by the coalescence of many similar communities; that is not an exceptional law; it is a universal law. Britain, France, Spain, Germany, Austria, Italy—I need not go through the list—every great nation of which we have any history has become what it is not by Home Rule, but by the converse of Home Rule, by absorbing into a large community the smaller communities of the popula-

tion. This being the universal law of history, what is Mr. Gladstone's procedure? He ransacks the records of the past in order to find a few instances in which this process has been arrested at a certain stage and in which, nevertheless, absolute disruption of the community has not taken place. Is that the historic method? Is that argument? Is that the method by which we draw lessons for the future from the experience of the past? Mr. Gladstone omitted to call attention to any of those cases in which difference of institution and government within the community has led to its disruption and its dismemberment or to its conquest; he has absolutely omitted to consider the innumerable cases which embrace every great country in Europe in which the opposite process has taken place, and in which communities have become absorbed in the larger whole, and a great nation has been the product of the absorption of the smaller communities. I would recommend Mr. Gladstone to study a writer whom, I am sure, he admires, as I admire him—I mean Mr. John Morley. I recollect reading a most able and interesting disquisition of Mr. John Morley's dealing with certain phases of the French Revolution, and one of the greatest blessings which Mr. Morley found in the French Revolution was this—that the French Revolution did what the Monarchy had been unable to do; it abolished the differences between the different nationalities and communities of which we know the French nation is composed. Mr. Morley tells us in so many words that one of the great blessings conferred by the French Revolution upon the French was that they no longer called themselves Bretons nor Normans, Gascons nor Provençals; that with one ruthless sweep of the pen the National Assembly destroyed these distinctions, and from the date of 1790 every subject of France was a Frenchman. Bundles of autonomous communities no doubt have formed and can form single political wholes; but they are not strong, they are not capable of coping with more concentrated communities; they are essentially at a lower stage of political organisation; they lack that flexibility which enables them to deal with new situations and with new difficulties."

The Board of Agriculture Bill had an easy course in the House of Commons, and was only met by a trivial opposition in the House of Lords. On the Bill being considered in Committee in the former House (June 24), Mr. H. H. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) moved an amendment requiring the officers of the new department to be appointed from the present staff of the Agricultural Department of the Privy Council. He withdrew the amendment on an assurance from Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*) that the Secretary would, if possible, be appointed from the present staff. The Bill was read a third time (June 27), and passed the House of Lords (July 28). On the motion for the second reading of the Bann Drainage Bill in the House of Commons (June 24) Mr. Storey (*Sunderland*) moved the rejection of

the Bill, and protested against the advance of further sums from the Imperial Exchequer for Irish local drainage. He characterised the scheme as a piece of bribery, deliberately conceived and carried out at the expense of the British taxpayer. After some discussion, Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) contended that the Drainage Bills were in every respect tenants' Bills rather than landlords' Bills, and added that everything approaching a party tinge had been kept out of them. They had been submitted to the House solely in consequence of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Sir George Trevelyan (*Bridgeton, Glasgow*) opposed the Bill before the House, on the ground that it contained an unsound system which had absolutely failed. The amendment was negatived by 209 to 78, and the second reading was carried by 205 to 59. The measure was ultimately withdrawn, as were also the Barrow, Shannon, and Tuck Drainage Bills, there being not enough time to deal with them during the session as opposed measures.

A debate was raised (June 25) by Mr. Cuninghame Graham (*Lanark, N.W.*) on the refusal of the Government to allow the British representatives at the Labour Conference at Berne to take part in discussions on the limitation of the hours of labour and the restriction of production. Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) said that the British representatives had only joined in the conference on the express understanding that the discussions would be strictly limited to the subjects of Sunday labour and the labour of women and children. Mr. J. Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) ridiculed the notion of limiting the hours of male labour by legislation, but he advocated full discussion, because he was satisfied that the more the question was discussed the more thoroughly would working-men see the utter fallacy of the proposal. Mr. Ritchie (*St. George's, Tower Hamlets*) replied that it would be contrary to diplomatic usage to allow representatives of this country to go into conference empowered to discuss proposals as to which the Government had made up their minds absolutely that they were not in the interests of the country. An equally casual debate occurred (June 28) on a motion by Mr. Lea (*Londonderry, S.*) for a committee to inquire into the circumstances attending the sale of estates in Ireland, belonging to the Salters' and other London companies. He alleged that the Salters' and Grocers' Companies in particular had acted unfairly and harshly towards their tenants by demanding higher prices for their estates than the judicial rents justified. Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) assented to an inquiry, while he repudiated the suggestion that the Land Purchase Commissioners would sanction any bargain between the companies and their tenants that would be unjust. A Bill to provide a site for a National Portrait Gallery—the funds for the erection of which had been given by an anonymous donor—was read a second

time (July 1), and passed its subsequent stages in both Houses of Parliament without opposition.

The state of affairs in Crete was the subject of a question addressed to Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords (June 24) by Lord Colchester. The Prime Minister replied that there was no truth in the report that the Powers had been considering a proposition for the annexation of Crete, either in whole or in part. There were considerable differences, he said, and there was much hostility amongst the members of the Assembly in Crete, and he was afraid that some time would elapse before there would prevail in the country that spirit without which the working of constitutional institutions could not be successful. Lord Salisbury was interrogated by Lord Castletown (June 25) as to a dispute between the Delagoa Bay Railway Company and the Portuguese Government, and replied that as communications were still being exchanged on the subject, he could not at present produce papers relating to it. The third reading of the Land Transfer Bill was moved in the House of Lords (June 25) by the Lord Chancellor, who recapitulated its objects, and stated that the principle of the Bill had been affirmed by their lordships without a division in four successive Sessions. The Bill was opposed by several noble lords on the grounds, among others, that compulsory registration of title would be inconvenient and costly, that the present system of land transfer was not of a cumbrous or dilatory character, and that if it was sought to assimilate the devolution of real property to that of personal property, this should be done openly, and by a measure having that express object. Lords Selborne and Herschell supported the Bill, and it was defended by Lord Salisbury. The third reading was carried by the narrow majority of 9, the numbers being 113 to 104. On the question of passing the Bill (July 5), Lord Beauchamp moved an amendment providing that registration should only be required in cases of sale, but the amendment was negatived by 119 to 93. The Marquis of Bath moved to omit Clause 74, which provided that land left under a will should, like personal property so left, be vested in the executors for a year, and this amendment was carried by 122 to 113. Lord Salisbury thereupon, declaring the clause to be vital to the Bill, said he did not think it advisable under the circumstances to proceed with the measure, which was accordingly withdrawn.

The alleged outrages in Armenia were referred to in the House of Lords (June 28) by Lord Carnarvon, who expressed the opinion that the serious state of affairs in that country was a source of great danger to international peace. The Archbishop of Canterbury suggested that if details given by missionaries and others as to the ill-treatment of Christians were denied, the production of Consular reports might throw light on the subject. Lord Salisbury, while expressing the interest of the Government in the condition of the Armenian Christians, said that

the engagement entered into by the Porte with respect to its Christian subjects did not impose any special obligations on this country. There were grave difficulties, he added, in the government of such a country as Armenia, arising from differences of race and from Mahomedan fanaticism. The Turkish Ambassador positively denied that certain events alleged to have occurred in Armenia had really happened. A further statement in regard to the action of the Portuguese authorities at Delagoa Bay was made by Lord Salisbury (July 1), in reply to an inquiry from Lord Rosebery. The Prime Minister stated that the Government had no exact information as to what was going on. They had to trust to telegrams, but in order to cope with the difficulty they had sent three ships to Delagoa Bay. The action of the Portuguese Government in the matter had been very high-handed, and in his opinion unjust, and that Government had been informed that they would be held responsible for any loss to British subjects arising from the course they had taken.

Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) addressed a large Unionist assembly at Hanley (June 26), his speech being chiefly occupied with a reply to some of Mr. Gladstone's speeches in the West. Referring to the argument in favour of Home Rule based on examples of delegated government in foreign countries, Mr. Goschen observed:—"He proposes to establish a separate Parliament under the control of a superior Parliament. That has never existed with success in any European State. His argument is not analogous and is entirely fallacious. Of all the cases he has quoted there is none where there has been what I may call an Imperial people with a vast number of colonies, with an Indian Empire, and with those duties and those responsibilities which we have inherited from our forefathers, and which we still maintain. Mr. Gladstone speaks of Sweden and Norway; he speaks of Iceland; he might as well speak of the Isle of Man, where, I believe, the grant of local self-government has been entirely successful; he speaks of Belgium and Holland; he speaks of Turkey. I contend that in none of these cases, except, perhaps, in the last, is there that general sway over an extended Empire which falls to our lot. One argument which has never been answered is—that a nation which has to govern an Empire of 200 millions cannot be compared with one of those dual governments which Mr. Gladstone compares us with. Mr. Gladstone appealed to Turkey with some apology, and said, 'We may even learn a lesson from Turkey.' It is extremely possible. He knew Turkey had given self-government to Samos, Lebanon, and Rhodes, and the experiment had answered uncommonly well. But he left out Crete. It is a sort of self-government that has been a thorn in the side of Turkey.—It is her weakness, in all her difficulties with Greece, and though Turkey was right in granting autonomy to Crete, you cannot say that the power of Turkey has been increased in consequence. And how about

Eastern Roumelia? Eastern Roumelia is practically separated from Turkey at this moment. Is there one single person in the Gladstonian party who would be content that the tie between Ireland and this country should resemble the tie between Eastern Roumelia and Turkey?"

Proceeding to speak of the indefiniteness of Home Rule as the project now stood, Mr. Goschen said:—"A very distinguished member of his (Mr. Gladstone's) party, Mr. Asquith, asked the other day that they might be taken into confidence. Mr. Asquith is a logician. He is sent on to the platform to speak, and the poor man does not know what the views of his leader are at present, so he makes a piteous appeal to be taken into confidence; but how can he be taken into confidence if there is no plan? I think there is no plan in Mr. Gladstone's breast, but he is forcing a plan upon his followers—forcing them day by day down the incline to which the dissolving forces which have been set in motion are pushing them. Having gone through two stages, this Home Rule question has now entered upon a third stage. The first stage was that there was to be a Parliament in Dublin, and the Irish members were not to be retained in Westminster. But we Unionists proved the dangers of such a plan, the certain friction of such a plan. We proved that it would mar the Imperial unity, and the Gladstonians themselves felt this so strongly that it is dead, killed by argument. It has crumbled to pieces under the remaining consciousness of even the Gladstonian Separatists that the Imperial unity must be maintained. The plan now is that the Irish representatives are to remain in London. When they are there what are they to do? Are they merely to control foreign affairs and the defence of the country, or are they to control English and Scotch and Welsh legislation? If we are not to control Irish affairs, I do not think the Irish ought to control English or Scotch affairs. And this is beginning to be recognised, and I call the attention of the people of this country to the consequences which are going to accrue from this new phase, on which some light is thrown by the utterances of Mr. Gladstone. . . . People are beginning to advocate different Parliaments for different parts of the country—a Parliament for Wales, another for Scotland, and another for Ireland; but have they thought out the consequences of such a change? It affects the whole of our Constitution. It puts it into a crucible; and how would it come out? Have they considered the effect of dealing in a particular way with 4,000,000 of people in Ireland out of 34,000,000 in the United Kingdom, or 4,000,000 out of 200,000,000 who owe allegiance to the Queen? I must, however, deduct the loyal minority in Ireland; but, for the sake of a portion of the Irish people I will say, Are you prepared to undo the work which it has taken centuries to build up?"

Lord Derby dealt with the federal phase of the Home Rule question in an address which he delivered to the Women's

Liberal Unionist Association at Westminster Town Hall (June 27). "It is seen at last," he said, "that the question of Irish nationality involves that of federal union, not between two nationalities only, but between four. That is an important advance, because it gives us something like a principle to discuss. Now I say nothing against federal unions in general. They may create a firm and lasting bond. They have done so in the case of Switzerland on a small scale, and in the case of America on a great scale. I omit more recent instances, because in such matters time is the only real test of success. But I lay down this rule with confidence—that no federal union can be stable or successful except where there is some at least approximate equality of importance and power between its various component States; or at any rate that no such union can exist where one State alone can outweigh all the rest put together. Now that would be the case with us. If England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland are to be treated as separate States, united for federal purposes, the effect of that will be that in all federal matters—in all matters, that is, concerning the whole—the three minor States, supposing them agreed among themselves, may at any moment be overruled by the single voice of England. You cannot prevent that if representative power is to be equally apportioned according to population. And if wealth is to have anything to do with the proportion of representation the superiority of England will be even more marked. Now what would follow from that state of things? Why, that your ingenious plan for emancipating the so-called nationalities only ends in placing them in a position of more entire, more marked, and more unmistakable dependence. They are no longer one with England, incorporated with us; but they must do in all matters of Imperial concern whatever England pleases. They are half separated only in order that they may be made to feel more thoroughly their position of subordination. That is not, I think, a gift of freedom for which they are likely to feel very thankful." Replying to certain arguments of Mr. Gladstone's, Lord Derby said:—"Ireland is represented by Mr. Gladstone in his recent Cornish tour, and by many others, as having suffered grievously from the Union. Well, is it or is it not the fact that in regard of material prosperity, in regard of the comfort and well-being of the people, Ireland has advanced more rapidly in the last fifty years than any other part of the British Islands? I have no doubt myself of the answer to that query. Wages are higher, food is better, the single-room mud hovels of old days are being displaced by cottages of the English type, and nobody now sees the crowds of beggars that used to hang about the towns and infest the high roads. But there is another way of looking at the matter. All Ireland is under the same law. Admitting, which I do, the relative poverty of the south and west when measured by an English standard, how comes it that Ulster

flourishes, as to everybody's knowledge it does? If political causes have operated elsewhere to keep Ireland poor, why not there also? If the Union has impoverished Cork and Galway, why has it not impoverished Belfast? Yet we know the contrary to be the case. That fact alone is to my mind conclusive as to the backwardness of Ireland in general not being due to the English connection. I do not say that English misgovernment in past times may not have had something to do with it; but it is rather late in the day to be called upon to apologise for religious disabilities which ceased two generations ago, for commercial restrictions which ceased ninety years ago, or for penal laws which have had no operative existence for considerably more than a century."

The discussion of the Scotch Universities Bill in Committee of the House of Commons, and after amendment in Committee, occupied more or less of eight sittings (June 25 to July 30). The discussions turned on points of detail, concerning the appointment of the Universities Commission, the nomination of members of the Courts of the several Universities, the appointment of assessors, the amount of the grant from the Consolidated Fund, the maintenance of the faculty of theology and the retention of theological tests, the control of existing faculties, the patronage of professorships, the institution of new degrees, the recognition of extra-mural teaching, and other matters of an academical character. Considerable interest was manifested in the debates, though the chief part in them was naturally taken by the members for Scotch constituencies. The Government yielded on the point of giving local representation to the Municipalities of St. Andrews and Dundee in the University Court of St. Andrews, and to the Town Councils of Glasgow and Aberdeen in the Courts of those Universities. By the grant of 42,000*l.* a year the Universities were to derive a new advantage to the extent of 14,000*l.* a year—the previous grants having amounted to 28,000*l.*—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that if the Commission, in revising the salaries of the Professors, should be involved in difficulties by having to give compensation for reductions, he would not be unwilling to ask Parliament for some further help. On the question of theological tests, the Government proposed to drop such tests entirely for all the chairs held by laymen; while, with regard to the theological chairs, their proposal was to refer the question of security for safe doctrinal teaching to the Universities Commissioners, who should report on the subject to Parliament. To this course Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) objected, and he moved an amendment, which was not carried, for the entire abolition of tests. The Bill was read a third time and passed on July 31.

The Scotch Local Government Bill was considered in Committee, and as amended (July 4–23), almost side by side with the Universities Bill. As in the case of that measure, the

debates largely turned on points of detail of no general interest, but there were several matters of principle which occasioned much discussion. Chief among these was the financial arrangement—the devolution of part of the Probate Duty—by which the Government proposed to afford relief to school fees in elementary schools, that relief, according to the original scheme of the Bill, having reference only to the first three standards. This proposal was not accepted by the Scotch members, who contended for such an enlargement of the relief as would make the first five standards free. The point was one upon which the Government showed a disposition to yield, and their attitude was interpreted by Mr. Mundella (*Sheffield, Brightside*) (July 11) as foreshadowing a general system of free education throughout the country. Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) repudiated that view of the object of the Government, but at a later period (July 16) Mr. Balfour stated that the Government were prepared to extend the school grant, and that under the new arrangement the amount applicable to the relief of fees would be 246,500*l.* a year, which would practically cover the fees in the first five standards. An opposition, feeble in point of numbers, to the payment of any part of the school fees, was led by Mr. Howorth (*Salford, S.*), who moved an amendment with that object (July 11), the amendment being defeated by 245 to 52. Mr. Esslemont (*Iberdenshire, E.*) proposed (July 12) that denominational schools should be excluded from participation in the benefits of the grant, but it was pointed out by the Lord Advocate (*Buteshire*) that such an exclusion would shut out large sections of the population from a share in a public boon which should belong to the whole people of Scotland, and the amendment was negatived without a division. An amendment, moved by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling*), for transferring the control of the police to the County Councils was defeated (July 5) by 205 to 113. A new clause, proposed by the Lord Advocate (July 12), providing that no woman should be eligible as a county councillor, was adopted; and at the same sitting an amendment to another clause, moved by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, giving to married women who were-qualified the same municipal franchises as were conferred upon unmarried women, was rejected by 111 to 56. The Bill was read a third time and passed July 24.

In the House of Lords—where at this period the Coal Dues Abolition Bill and other measures from the House of Commons passed through their several stages with little or no opposition—attention was again drawn to the Delagoa Bay Railway question (July 9). Lord Castletown moved that immediate action should be taken to obtain from the Portuguese Government adequate compensation for the debenture holders and shareholders of the railway company, and for the effectual protection of all British interests involved in the matter. Lord Salisbury reminded their lordships that the dispute was one

between the Portuguese Government and a Portuguese company, and therefore the case was not the same as it would have been if that Government had deprived an English company of rights conferred upon it. Her Majesty's Government could not undertake to collect the debts due to British creditors by foreign States; but where British capitalists were damnified by the wrongful action of a foreign Government they had a right to make that Government responsible. On a former occasion he had informed the House that the Portuguese Government would be held responsible for loss to British subjects arising from its high-handed action in this matter; but as yet they did not know how far British subjects had been damnified, and therefore it would be premature to adopt the motion. Lord Derby thought that the coming to a vote on the motion would injure the cause which Lord Castletown advocated. One of the most difficult questions in diplomacy was that of action by a Government for pecuniary loss by subjects of the country represented. In ordinary cases such action was not advisable; but he did not say that it might not be taken where grave pecuniary loss had arisen from the action of another Government. In the present instance we were not yet in possession of the case of the other side. The motion was then withdrawn. A Bill for granting a representative Government to Western Australia, brought in by Lord Knutsford (July 1), was read a second time (July 11), after being favourably criticised by Lords Carnarvon, Kimberley, and Derby. It was afterwards (July 16) read a third time, and sent to the Commons, where it was not proceeded with. The Duke of Argyll, in a long speech embodying an historical sketch of the growth of disaffection in Ireland, moved (July 15) for papers relating to the evictions on the Olphert estates, and claimed for Mr. Olphert that he had treated his tenants with the most generous consideration. Lord Granville, who offered no objection to the motion—which was carried—declined to follow the Duke in his historical arguments, but observed that the House had heard a one-sided impassioned appeal founded on evidence taken 80 years ago.

Two graceful acts of recognition of the services of public men are to be recorded at this time. Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*) was entertained at a banquet at St. James's Hall, London (July 3), in celebration of his twenty-one years of parliamentary life. An address of congratulation was presented to him on behalf of his constituents, and, in replying to it, Mr. Smith reviewed the political changes and the general progress which had occurred in the period. The freedom of Cardiff was presented to Mr. Gladstone (July 6), by a deputation from the corporation of that town, at the London residence of Sir E. J. Reed, M.P. (*Cardiff*). Mr. Gladstone made two speeches on the occasion, the first of them being of a non-contentious character, and the second a political address, spoken in reply to the toast of his health

Referring, in this second speech, to his Irish proposals, Mr. Gladstone observed:—"I have never said the absurd thing imputed to me, that all Europe was in favour of our Home Rule Bill. I do not think I can expect all Europe to understand it. What I said is this, that all Europe, through its permanent literature, in every civilised country condemns in the most unequivocal manner the policy that England has pursued towards Ireland. But when I come to the Anglo-Saxon people, to the population of the colonies, and to the great American nation, then I come to deal with those who have a much greater capacity of understanding in principle and in detail what we are about. I will not speak now of the opinion of the colonies. I am satisfied to rest upon the fact that Canada, through her Legislative Assembly, has declared herself unequivocally on this subject; but I will say a word about America, and, if it had not been that I did not wish to bring in my arms a book that nearly fills them, I would have brought to you a most remarkable testimonial of American feeling that I have lately received from the State of New York, in the shape of a beautifully-illuminated address which has been sent in duplicate, one to Mr. Parnell and one to myself, expressing the sympathies of almost every person in authority—executive, judicial, and legislative—in the State of New York with respect to the condition of things in this country." Mr. Gladstone then went on to speak of a testimony in favour of Home Rule, which he had received from the State of Illinois. "It may be unimportant," he added, "because, after all, it is not the Senate of Illinois that is going to govern the United Kingdom. That is quite true. But at the same time this I do say—when we find a vast and constantly growing nation, which may shortly become the primary Power of our race in the civilised world, which in fact is advancing by rapid strides to that position, when we find a unanimity upon a question of this kind prevailing in these quarters in a free country, in a country where every sort of difference of opinion is absolutely free, and all the circumstances of their institutions encourage them to the exercise of that freedom—this I do say, and I will not go beyond it, it is a circumstance that ought to give material for reflection to every prudent and considerate man in this country."

The most important business before Parliament at the end of the Session, and that which excited most interest alike in the House of Commons and in the country, was a proposal for an addition to the Royal Grants. Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*) (July 2) brought up two messages from her Majesty, the first of which expressed the Queen's desire to provide for Prince Albert Victor, while the second informed the House of the intended marriage of the Princess Louise of Wales to the Earl of Fife, and expressed the confidence of her Majesty that her "faithful Commons" would enable her to make suitable provision for her Royal

Highness. Mr. Smith proposed, and Mr. Gladstone (*Midlothian*) seconded (July 4), that a Select Committee be appointed to consider these messages, to inquire into the former practice of the House with respect to provisions for members of the Royal Family, and to report to the House upon the principles which in that respect it was expedient to adopt in the future. The motion was agreed to, after an amendment moved by Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*) for extending the inquiry to the Civil List had been rejected by 313 to 125. A Committee, consisting of twenty-three members, was appointed (July 9) on a motion by Mr. W. H. Smith (*Strand*). The Committee held its first meeting on the following day, and appointed Mr. Smith chairman. At this meeting the Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) handed in papers bearing on the subjects which the Committee had to consider, from one of which it appeared that since her Majesty's accession the total savings on the Civil List transferred to the Privy Purse had amounted to 824,025*l.* The proposals of the Government, as submitted to the Committee, were that the provision for the eldest son of the Heir Apparent should be an annuity of 10,000*l.*, to be increased on his marriage to 25,000*l.*; that the provision for every other son should be 8,000*l.*, to be increased at his marriage to 15,000*l.*; and that the provision for every daughter of the Heir Apparent should be an annuity of 3,000*l.*, and a capital sum of 10,000*l.* on marriage. The Government also proposed that provision should be made for the children of other sons of the Queen, except such sons as might succeed to a foreign throne, while they expressed the view that, as her Majesty had signified her readiness to provide for the children of her daughters, it was unnecessary to ask Parliament to make any provision for them. At an early stage of the proceedings, Mr. Gladstone suggested that a quarterly payment should be made to a separate account on behalf of the Prince of Wales, from which assignments of money should be made to the Prince's children. The Government adopted this suggestion in principle—abandoning their own proposals—and embodied it in a draft report which was laid before the Committee by Mr. Smith. This report, varied only by the substitution of 9,000*l.* for 10,000*l.* in clause 15, and by some verbal amendments, was that afterwards presented to the House of Commons, and which was as follows:—

“Your Committee find that since the accession of the House of Hanover—

“1. There is precedent for provision out of public moneys for every child of an Heir Apparent, and there is no precedent for the omission of such provision.

“2. There is precedent for provision out of public moneys for every child of every younger son of a Sovereign, and there is no precedent for the omission of such provision.

“3. There is precedent for provision out of public moneys for the children of a younger son of the Heir Apparent; there

are two instances of such provision, and there is no precedent for the omission of such provision.

"4. There is no precedent for making any provision out of public moneys for the children of the daughter of a Sovereign, where such daughter has married a foreign ruling Prince.

"5. There is no precedent one way or the other as to the children of other daughters. Princess Mary, daughter of George III., was the only Princess who, prior to the present reign, married any one but a foreign ruling Prince, and she had no children.

"6. Your Committee find that upon the accession of her Majesty to the throne the revenues of the Crown lands and the small branches of hereditary revenue which had been surrendered to the public during the reign of William IV. became by statute (1 Will. IV. c. 25) payable to her Majesty.

"7. By the Act 1 Vict. c. 2, these revenues which had thus become payable to her Majesty were carried to and made part of the Consolidated Fund during her Majesty's lifetime in confidence that the Commons would 'gladly make adequate provision for the support of the honour and dignity of the Crown.'

"8. In the first year of her Majesty the net surplus of the Crown lands thus surrendered amounted to 150,000*l.*, to which should be added certain sums for Royal parks and palaces, amounting to 60,000*l.*, which were then defrayed out of the gross income of the Crown lands, but are now voted by Parliament, so that the total produce of Crown lands available for the public was in 1837-38 about 210,000*l.* In the year 1888-89 the net surplus from the Crown lands, similarly available for the public, was about 396,000*l.* In the first year of her Majesty the small branches of the hereditary revenue surrendered paid 5,000*l.* into the Exchequer. In 1888-89 they paid 68,000*l.* into the Exchequer.

"9. The same statute (1 Vict. c. 2), which accepted the proceeds of the Crown lands and of the small branches of the hereditary revenue, fixed the Civil List at 385,000*l.*, of which 60,000*l.* was assigned to the Privy Purse.

"10. According to invariable practice the revenues of the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster were not included in the surrender of the hereditary revenues, and they both remained payable to her Majesty till the Duchy of Cornwall was transferred to the Prince of Wales in 1841.

"In the first four years of the present reign her Majesty received a total sum of 66,500*l.* from the Duchy of Cornwall, and of 44,000*l.* from the Duchy of Lancaster, giving an average annual receipt of 27,500*l.* from the two sources.

"From 1841 to 1861 the sums annually paid to the Queen from the Duchy of Lancaster amounted upon an average to 16,000*l.*; and during that time the Prince Consort received an annuity of 30,000*l.*

"On the death of the Prince Consort that annuity ceased,

and in the interval between 1861 and 1889 the payments to her Majesty from the Duchy of Lancaster have risen from 22,000*l.* to 50,000*l.*, giving an average receipt of 39,000*l.*

"11. During the present reign annuities charged on the Consolidated Fund, and grants of money in supply, have repeatedly been made to various members of the Royal Family, including, among others, annuities to the children of a younger son of his late Majesty King George III.

"12. In the first year of her Majesty the annuities charged on the Consolidated Fund for members of the Royal Family amounted to 277,000*l.*; after deducting that part of King Leopold's annuity which he returned to the Exchequer. The annuities now payable to members of the Royal Family are reduced to 152,000*l.*

"13. Your Committee cannot find that any notice has ever been given to the Crown by any resolution of the House of Commons, or in any declaration on behalf of a Government by a Minister of the Crown, that the practice which has heretofore prevailed in reference to making provision for members of the Royal Family would be changed; or that her Majesty has had any ground for supposing that it was necessary for her Majesty herself to make provision for the members of her family.

"14. In view of the facts above stated, your Committee are of opinion that her Majesty would have a claim on the liberality of Parliament, should she think fit to apply for such grants as, in accordance with precedent, may become requisite for the support of the Royal Family. But your Committee have been informed by the First Lord of the Treasury that her Majesty has been graciously pleased to declare that she does not propose to press this claim for the children of her daughters and younger sons, and with regard to the daughters and younger sons of future Sovereigns your Committee are of opinion that at the proper time arrangements should be made under which no future claim of a similar kind can arise.

"15. The most gracious message of her Majesty, which your Committee has been directed to consider, has reference to the family of the Heir Apparent alone.

"In order to prevent repeated applications to Parliament, and to establish the principle that the provision for children should hereafter be made out of grants adequate for that purpose which have been assigned to their parents, your Committee recommend the creation of a special fund by the quarterly payment during the present reign of 9,000*l.* out of the Consolidated Fund. Out of this his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with the sanction of her Majesty and the assent of the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would be empowered to make such assignments and in such manner to his children as his Royal Highness should in his discretion think fit."

Mr. Gladstone moved that the following clauses be substituted for Articles 13 and 14 respectively, namely:—"In lieu of paragraph 13:—'Your Committee cannot find in any resolution of the House of Commons, or in any declaration on behalf of a Government by a Minister of the Crown, any indication whether the practice followed in the case of grandchildren of George III. was to continue under the method now applied to the Civil List, or whether any, and if any what, obligation attached to the Sovereign with reference to descendants in the second generation, or what claims the Sovereign might be entitled to make upon the national resources.' In lieu of clause 14:—'Your Committee have recited the facts of previous practice in accordance with the order of reference under which they have been appointed. An important question arises whether, and how far, these facts form a ground of action under the new method, which at a period later than the reign of George III. has been applied to the Civil List, and since the Duchy of Lancaster has added so largely to the means at the disposal of the Sovereign. A further addition to these means might also be expected, in the judgment of your Committee, from possible retrenchments to be made in connection with offices in the Royal Household and otherwise. But the Committee find it to be unnecessary for them to enter on a discussion of this question, inasmuch as they have been informed by the First Lord of the Treasury that her Majesty has been graciously pleased to declare that she does not propose to advance any claim for the children of her daughters and younger sons.'"

— The Committee divided upon these two clauses, with the result that each of the original clauses was retained by 12 votes to 10. On the consideration of paragraph 15 a division was challenged, when the paragraph was adopted by 16 votes to 6. Mr. J. Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*), who had voted in the minority, thereupon stated that, inasmuch as the Government had declined to agree to the amendment to Clause 13, he could not be a party to any increase in the Heir Apparent's allowance.

Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) prepared an independent report, which the Committee refused to adopt by 19 votes to 2, the minority consisting of Mr. Labouchere himself and Mr. Burt (*Morpeth*). This report stated that, in the opinion of the Committee, there were ample funds belonging to her Majesty and the Prince of Wales from which provision could be made for children of the Prince and Princess of Wales during the lifetime of the Queen. Also that the funds at the disposal of the Queen were sufficient to enable her to make provision for the children of her younger children, without trenching upon the annual expenditure deemed necessary for the honour and dignity of the Crown. The report of the majority was finally adopted by the Committee without a division.

This report was presented to the House on July 22. Mr.

W. H. Smith (*Strand*), in moving (July 25) that the House should go into Committee to consider the messages received from her Majesty, stated that the Queen had intimated that no claim would be pressed for the children of her younger sons and of her daughters, and the only practical question remaining was therefore the provision to be made for the children of the Prince of Wales. Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) moved an amendment setting forth that the funds at the disposal of her Majesty and of the other members of the Royal Family were adequate, without further demands upon the taxpayers, to enable suitable provision to be made for her Majesty's grandchildren, and that such provision might, if desired, be increased by the abolition of various offices in the royal household. Mr. Gladstone (*Middlethian*) thought it was unfair to expect that the Prince of Wales, whose income was almost exactly the same as when it was voted by Parliament as being necessary for maintaining the dignity of the Heir Apparent, should take upon himself the maintenance of his children as they became heads of separate establishments, or entered into families where his daughters ought not to enter absolutely penniless. Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*) contended (July 26) that the savings on the Civil List belonged to the nation, and ought to remain subject to the control of Parliament. Lord Hartington (*Rossendale*), after a long discussion, pointed out the impossibility of laying down a hard and fast rule as to royal grants. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) declared that a large portion of the Civil List savings had been expended on purposes many of which were of a national character, while many were charitable purposes. The amendment was negatived by 398 to 116, and the House then went into Committee. On Mr. W. H. Smith's resolution being moved in Committee (July 29), authorising the payment out of the Consolidated Fund of 36,000*l.* a year, to be applied for the benefit of the children of the Prince of Wales, Mr. J. Morley (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) moved an amendment setting out the unwillingness of the Committee to make such a grant as was proposed in a manner which left room for further claims. Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) held that the moderate savings of the Queen were insufficient to provide for the younger branches of the Royal Family, and that her Majesty's total income—which he contended did not exceed 105,000*l.* a year—was a reasonable and moderate allowance. Mr. Chamberlain characterised the member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) and his friends, by whom an uncompromising opposition to the proposed grant had been maintained, as the "Nihilists of English politics." Sir William Harcourt (*Derby*) supported the amendment on the ground that there was attached to the grant a declaration of claim which was unsound and which sought to bind a future Parliament. Mr. Morley's amendment was negatived by 355 to 134, and the resolution was agreed to.

The Prince of Wales's Children Bill, by which effect was given to the resolution of the House of Commons, was read a first time on July 30, and a second time on the following day. In Committee it was persistently opposed by Mr. Storey (*Sunderland*), Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*), and other members, but the various amendments proposed were defeated by large majorities. The Bill was read a third time and passed Aug. 5, on which day the House of Lords read it a first time, and it passed that House Aug. 9.

The proceedings in reference to the further royal grant brought out a marked disagreement of opinion between Mr. Gladstone and some of his supposed followers. It was with respect to this fact that Mr. Goschen (*St. George's, Hanover Square*), speaking at a banquet at which he was entertained by the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, at the Hôtel Métropole, London (July 17), made the following observations:—"I call the attention of the public to this point—that if our opponents conjure with the great name of Gladstone in the constituencies, they do not follow Mr. Gladstone in the lobbies in the House of Commons. They are prepared to exploit to the last degree the prestige of his 50 years, the admiration of the country for him, but they are not prepared to make any sacrifices for him in the lobbies if he stands by the traditions which those 50 years of political experience have imposed upon himself. I ask you to contemplate this pathetic and, I regret to say, this instructive sight. Here is the man with whose name they wish to sweep the country. They think that by putting him forward as their leader they will be able to throw over those principles which are ours, and which we are defending against him and against his hosts, but especially against him; but at the same time they are unwilling to give an unpopular vote, even as a kind of recognition of what they owe to their titular leader. At the present time they will go to Bingley Hall and stand by his side and enjoy a kind of reflected satisfaction from the enthusiasm with which their leader is received; but when on the Royal grants he gives a vote which they think their constituents may dislike they desert their leader, and they will not follow him into the lobby, and, out of the hosts who shout his name in the constituencies, 35 alone, if I am not mistaken, are willing to pass through the lobby when he tells them that his traditions, that his experience, and his sense of right and justice compel him to give a particular vote. Gentlemen, I do not say this, I assure you in all honesty, in order to give pain to any of our opponents. I think it is a pathetic sight. I think it is pathetic to see that a man who has made such tremendous sacrifices for the party who are, I will not say following him, but who are to a certain extent endorsing him—I say it is a pathetic sight to see that in the House of Commons he is so unable as he is at present to exercise any authority over

the rest of his party; and I allude to the subject for this reason—that there are thousands of sensible people in the country and thousands of people who think, if they still have got the security of Mr. Gladstone's name in the case of a change of Government, that looking to his past, that looking to his power, that looking to his traditions and looking to his experience, they will be safe against those wild chimeras and those wild plans which his more advanced followers are continually endeavouring to force upon the country. I say that there is no such security whatever. I say that Mr. Gladstone has ceased to be able to control the party of which he is the nominal head, and that the public cannot believe that if they return him and his friends to power, he will be able to control English, Scotch, and Welsh legislation. I say that the conditions that have been placed upon him are such that it would be the violent section of his party, and not himself, that will give the future character to the legislation of this country."

Lord Hartington presided at a dinner at the City Liberal Club, London, on the same day (July 17), and in proposing the toast of the United Kingdom referred to the tendency in the direction of Federal Home Rule which had become manifest. In the course of his remarks he said:—"I should like to ask you to look for a minute or two at this question from its very simplest point of view. I am not going to complicate the question by assuming, as I should have a perfect right to assume if I wished to do so, that the grant of autonomy to Ireland as one portion of the United Kingdom might be expected reasonably to be followed by demands for similar autonomy on the part of England, Wales, and Scotland. They all might with as much right and reason claim to be governed in their internal affairs by their own representatives, and that the will of their representatives should not be overruled by an Irish, Scotch, or Welsh majority. But I suppose that England, Scotland and Wales are going to remain as they are, and that this separate provincial Parliament is going to be established in Ireland only. But in that state of things let me put to you a very probable, and certainly not an impossible, case. Assume that at some given period there are parties into which the United Kingdom, England, Scotland, and Wales, are pretty nearly evenly divided upon some domestic and at the same time upon some Imperial question. Assume that the Conservative party is in a small majority in Great Britain. Assume at the same time—and it is not by any means impossible—that when the Irish members come over, as they are to come, to vote on Imperial affairs they convert the Liberal minority here into a Liberal majority. In this state of things what must happen? For the domestic affairs of Great Britain the Conservative majority must have a Government in which it has confidence—that is, a Conservative Government. For the affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ire-

land there must be a Liberal Government in which the majority of the Imperial Parliament will have full confidence. Therefore you will have under this system for the internal affairs of Great Britain a Conservative Government in power, and for the Imperial affairs of the United Kingdom you will have a Liberal Government in power. Will anyone tell me that a Government which is entrusted with the conduct of our Imperial affairs abroad, in relation to our colonies, in relation to our Indian possessions, in relation to our foreign affairs, will be able to act with the same decision, with the same determination, with the same promptitude and the same efficiency as it is able to do now, when it is confronted with a Government to which it is diametrically opposed, which will have the control of the affairs of six-sevenths of the population of the United Kingdom and more than six-sevenths of its resources? I say that such a result is an impracticable, an impossible, and an absurd result, and one which will never be tolerated in practice for an instant by the Irish people."

A proposal in the Town Council of Edinburgh, to confer the freedom of that city on Mr. Parnell (*Cork City*), was the occasion of a prolonged controversy, which was taken up by the public, and continued for several months. A vote on the proposal was challenged three times in the Council, with the result that a narrow and diminishing majority were in favour of conferring the freedom. In the final vote the majority numbered twenty-two, the whole Council consisting of forty-one members. The minority (among whom was the Lord Provost) protested that, pending the report of the Special Commission, it would be irregular and improper to bestow on Mr. Parnell so distinguished a mark of favour and confidence. The advocates of the motion declared, on the other hand, that the Special Commission was a tribunal instituted for party purposes only. Outside the Council a Committee was formed for the purpose of testing public opinion on the subject. This Committee took a *pléniscite* of the inhabitants by issuing a circular, with a post-card for a reply, inviting an answer from all male and female voters to the question—"Do you wish Mr. Parnell to receive the honour of the freedom of the city of Edinburgh?" The answers were to be simply "Yes" or "No." 21,014 replies were received, of which 17,813 were in the negative, while only 3,201 gave assent to the proposed action of the Council. In spite of this strong expression of opinion the Council proceeded to give effect to their resolution, and Mr. Parnell consented to accept the honour offered to him. The ceremony of conferring the freedom took place at Edinburgh on July 20. The Lord Provost did not attend, and the presentation to Mr. Parnell of the "Guild Brother's ticket" was made by Bailie Walcot. Mr. Parnell said that he accepted the gift of the city of Edinburgh as another token of the desire of Scotland to concede to Ireland all that she could justly claim. He reviewed

at considerable length the proceedings before the Special Commission, and referred more particularly to the refusal of the judges to permit an inspection of the books of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union. Had he known, he said, that the Commission could not take cognisance of "this conspiracy," he would not have put his foot inside the doors. He did not question Mr. Justice Hannen's interpretation of the powers of the Court under the Act of Parliament by which the Commission was constituted. "But," he added, "what does all this compel us to suppose? This Special Commission Act was drafted by the Government lawyers after consultation with the Attorney-General. It must have been deliberately drafted for the purpose of cloaking up this conspiracy, and of preventing us from showing by whose money and by what men these charges were produced."

Mr. Parnell afterwards addressed a large meeting in the Corn Exchange, Edinburgh, at which Lord Aberdeen took the chair, and Mr. Childers (*Edinburgh, S.*) and Mr. Herbert J. Gladstone (*Leeds, W.*) were present. The following letter from Mr. Gladstone was read:—

"London, July 19, 1889.

"MY DEAR ABERDEEN,—I cannot allow to pass wholly without comment the occasion presented by the meeting to be held in Edinburgh to-morrow for a public reception of Mr. Parnell. It is not necessary now to go back upon the period before 1882, when sharp differences of opinion existed and were boldly and broadly expressed between the Nationalists of Ireland on the one hand and myself, as well as, I believe, the great body of the Liberal party, on the other. And the time has not yet arrived for setting forth in full the memorable experience of Mr. Parnell during the last two years. I will only say that I believe that experience to be without parallel in the history of British statesmen and of the British Parliament for the past two centuries. I will further frankly state that in the great controversy which is now going on I consider Mr. Parnell with his friends to be, in the best sense, a conservative and restorative force of great value and importance with reference to the peace and happiness of Ireland, the honour of England, the integrity of the United Kingdom, and the permanence and greatness of the Empire. I am convinced that at the present moment they, and he in particular, have been labouring to consolidate the foundations of legality, on the strength and stability of which our welfare essentially depends; while the ill-judged, ineffective, and tyrannical proceedings of the Government in Ireland have deepened that aversion of the Irish people to the administration of their affairs in a spirit truly anti-national, and have for the first time enlisted the feelings of great masses of the English people in widespread and determined antipathy to the

cause which in the sister island is unhappily and delusively described as the cause of law and order.

"I remain, always sincerely yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE."

A resolution cordially welcoming Mr. Parnell to Scotland, and congratulating him on "the near prospect of the triumphant success of the great national movement he had guided with so much dignity and sagacity" was moved by Mr. Childers and supported by Mr. H. J. Gladstone. In the first sentence of his reply Mr. Parnell alluded to the operations of the Land League, which he vindicated in the following terms:—"As the leader and the person undoubtedly responsible for the great movement of the Land League commenced in 1879, I have to admit to you that possibly there were regrettable accompaniments of that movement; but you must take a popular movement as a whole. You must judge it as a whole, and you must judge it by the circumstances and by what it has led to. The movement of the Land League was undoubtedly to some extent in its commencement a turbulent movement. It was the spontaneous uprising, the uncultivated uprising, of an enslaved people against their oppressors. It was provoked and stimulated almost beyond control by the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. If there was anything to be regretted, anything to be avoided, in the movement, you have to go back and to blame the originators of the movement, the hereditary legislators, who deliberately in 1880, in the face of the warning of Mr. Forster and of all who knew the state of Ireland only too well, shut the doors of the Constitution in the face of the Irish people, and bade them rely on their own resources rather than on anything they could hope for or expect from Parliament. But have we taken warning by experience? Have we been taught by events? Well, I think if there was anything to blame in the Land League movement, we have shown that we could profit by the experience of the past in the conduct of the movement that has succeeded it, the conduct of the movement of the National League, against which there has not been one single atom of evidence brought or alleged." Being asked by a person in the audience where the books of the Land League were, Mr. Parnell replied, "The secretary of the movement, which had existed since 1882, appeared in court with every book, every letter, every cheque, and every counterfoil." Proceeding afterwards to speak of the practical objections urged against Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule proposals, he remarked that there would, of course, be difficulties in the way of any solution of the Irish problem, adding that "the most perfect Constitution in the world—the American Constitution—could be proved by a logician to be unworkable in about ten minutes time."

In a further passage of his speech Mr. Parnell said:—"But in what way could Ireland, supposing she wished to injure you,

be more powerful to effect injury to your Imperial interests than she is at present? If you concede to her people the power to work out their own future, to make themselves happy and prosperous, how do you make yourselves weaker to withstand wrongdoing against yourselves? Is not your physical capacity the same as it is now? Have you not still your troops in the country? Have you not still all the power of the Empire? Then supposing Irishmen were so mad as to abuse, to wilfully throw away and spurn, the important advantages which you would confer, have you not still the power to protect yourselves and use the Imperial might just as you have it now? In what way do we make you weaker? In what way are we stronger to injure you? What soldiers should we have? What armed policemen should we have? What cannon should we have? What single means should we have, beyond the Constitution, that we have not now to work you injury? We should have none, but your strength would be greater to resist injustice from weak little Ireland against great and powerful Britain if we tried it. Your strength would be greater because you would have the moral power to put down rebellion before the world, that you have not now. You would have the knowledge that has been confirmed by the teaching of history from time immemorial, that great masses of people can never be spurred to rebellion so long as they are contented, happy, and free from oppression. And if the armed hand of revolution, after that concession of this great measure, were to be lifted against the authority of the Queen in Ireland, you could stamp out that rebellion as remorselessly with your power as you would a rebellion in the heart of Edinburgh, and you would be justified in the measures you took by the public opinion of the world. We should no longer have, as we have now, the sympathy of America in our struggle, we should no longer have the good wishes of all the Continental nations. But we should exhibit ourselves in the contemptible position of men who spurned the hand of those who tried to benefit them, and who stung the heel of those who worked for their good."

While the visit of the Shah of Persia—who arrived in England on 1st of July and left on the 29th—caused a certain holiday activity throughout the country, for his Majesty visited many of the chief provincial towns, Parliament did not shirk the drudgery which belongs to the end of the Session, nor did that necessary work prevent the introduction of trivial topics upon which the time of the House of Commons was spent to no purpose. A case of wrongful interference with the liberties of the subject inevitably cropped up (July 9). A youth named Henry Thompson, who had committed a larceny, and against whom a warrant had been issued, suffered himself to be arrested as a deserter from the navy, for which supposed offence he was sentenced in good faith to a term of imprisonment. The matter

came before the Queen's Bench Division on a writ of *habeas corpus* issued against Captain Woodward, by whom the youth was sentenced, and it was made the ground of a motion by Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*) to reduce the Navy Vote for Martial Law. Lord G. Hamilton (*Ealing*) explained the circumstances of the case, and defended the action of Captain Woodward and the Admiralty. The motion was negatived by 120 to 59.

The Tithe Rent Charge Recovery Bill, which had a somewhat troubled career, was read a second time July 18. It did not deal with the principle of tithes, or with the question of responsibility to pay them as between landlord and tenant, this being a subject on which the Government undertook to bring in a Bill in the Session of 1890. The present measure simply made tithe rent charge recoverable by action at law. It was strongly opposed as being only a partial and incomplete dealing with the question, but the second reading was carried by 208 to 151. On the motion to go into Committee (Aug. 12), numerous "instructions" were moved by various members, all of which were rejected. The Bill was discussed in Committee at two sittings (Aug. 13 and 14), and on the second occasion the Attorney-General (*Isle of Wight*) intimated that the Government were prepared to accept an amendment substituting the owner for the occupier, as the person against whom proceedings for recovery of tithe rent charge should be taken. Progress was thereupon reported to enable new clauses to be inserted with this object. The character of the Bill being entirely changed by these new clauses, Sir W. Harcourt (*Derby*) asked for the Speaker's ruling on the question, whether it was competent to the House to proceed with a fresh Bill constructed out of an old one. The Speaker held that the Bill, amended as was proposed, would differ altogether from that for the introduction of which leave was given, and stated that the practice of the House was that where a Bill had been so transformed a new Bill should be brought in. The measure was then withdrawn.

The Bill "to facilitate the construction of light railways in Ireland" was read a second time after some opposition (July 19), and was referred to the Standing Committee on Trade. Subsequently (Aug. 14) Mr. Storey (*Sunderland*) appealed to the Speaker against a decision of the Chairman of the Standing Committee, rejecting amendments which he (the Chairman) regarded as hostile to the Bill, but the Speaker declined to allow an appeal to himself from the decision of the Chairman of the Standing Committee on a point of order. On the Bill being considered as amended (Aug. 19), it was very fully discussed, and some slight amendments were made in it, after which it was read a third time. It passed the House of Lords without opposition (Aug. 27). A valuable measure with which Parliament dealt expeditiously at this time was the Infectious Disease Notification Bill, the object of which was to prevent the

spread of infectious diseases, by insuring that on their outbreak the medical officer of health and the inspector of nuisances should visit the premises on which the outbreak occurred, and should have power to isolate the patient or require his removal to a hospital. The Bill was read a second time (July 31), and passed its subsequent stages, and its various stages in the House of Lords, without serious opposition.

The last days of July were prolific of political speeches. Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Chamberlain, all contributed to the sum of eloquence which distinguished the last week of the month. Sir William Harcourt (*Derby*) entertained a Liberal meeting at Hereford (July 24) with some lively criticisms on his political opponents. After these more or less personal observations, he went on to defend the changes in Liberal policy, of which Home Rule was one. Their principles had of course, he said, undergone a change. If they had remained the same as they were ten or twenty years ago, they would not be Liberal principles. As well might people complain that the leaves of this summer were not the leaves of last. Just as Lord Palmerston and Earl Russell were in advance of the Tories of their day, so were the Liberals of this day in advance of the present day Tories. The only difference was that the pace was a little better.

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) replied to Mr. Parnell's Edinburgh speeches in an address at Salisbury (July 25). Observing that Mr. Parnell had handled the difficult problem of how to protect the loyal minority in Ireland, he said:—"Mr. Parnell touched upon that, and what did he tell us? His contribution, and his only contribution, to the solution of the difficult question was to suggest that the loyal minority might protect each other. Now I apprehend that Mr. Parnell is nothing if not a serious statesman, and how the loyal minority are to protect themselves except by force of arms—how they are to protect themselves within the limits of the Constitution against the tyranny of the Home Rule Parliament—the ingenuity of man has not yet been able to discover. And to tell us that the Loyalists in the South will be saved because, forsooth, there are Loyalists in the North is a mere mockery of political argument."

Passing on to allude to Mr. Gladstone's letter to Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Parnell's adulation of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Balfour said:—"You might as well expect two bankrupts to make a fortune by backing each other's bills as expect that the Separatist party will contrive to get a character by engaging the two great wings of it in ascribing every virtue in the calendar to each other. But contrast, merely as a matter of style, this gushing eloquence when each other's character is in question with the self-control and moderation, to use no stronger term, which they exhibit when they are dealing with certain very remarkable

phases of contemporaneous Irish history. For example, Mr. Parnell, in describing the movement of which he has been the head for the last ten years, said that it might be possible no doubt that it had been accompanied by regrettable incidents. That is a very modest, moderate, and self-contained method of describing the agitation which in five years had for its accompaniment 13,000 agrarian offences, 60 murders, and 400 mutilations of cattle of the most barbarous and horrible kind, carried out in a manner which I will not offend your ears by attempting to describe. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, follows out the same policy of moderation of statement, and I am reminded of a famous phrase once used by Mr. Parnell in the county of Tipperary, in a district where the murder of a son before his father's eyes had just occurred, when he said to a large meeting of his countrymen that in his opinion such murders were unnecessary and pre-judicial."

Dealing afterwards with Mr. Parnell's references to the Special Commission, and with his statement, *à propos* of the refusal of the court to allow an inspection of the books of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, that the books and papers of the Land League had all been produced, Mr. Balfour proceeded to say :—"Mr. Parnell declared that the reference to the Special Commission was so drawn that it was impossible for the Judges to make an adequate investigation into what he regards as the most important part of the case. Now, on what is that preposterous charge founded? It is founded upon this, that whereas an association known as the Loyal and Patriotic Union, whose business it is, I believe—for I know very little about its management—to supply literature and facts relating to Ireland to the British public—the allegation is that that Patriotic Union did not give him its bank books and its accounts in such a form that the alleged conspiracy to traduce him could be investigated by the help of those documents; and Mr. Parnell drew an elaborate comparison between the conduct of the Loyal and Patriotic Union, that did not allow their books to be shown, and the conduct of the Irish Land League, of which he was the head, and which he said had given all their accounts and all their banking transactions into Court. Now, what are the facts? Contrast that statement, which does not misrepresent Mr. Parnell's views as expressed at Edinburgh, with the real facts of the case. The Loyal and Patriotic Union handed into the Court every document concerned with their association bearing upon the expenditure of funds, and they, of course, offered the Judges and the Court the fullest right to investigate every particular item in those books. And they did more: they offered to allow Sir Charles Russell, the counsel for the defendants, to see in those books whether there was any foundation for the specific allegation that the Loyal and Patriotic Union had given a certain sum of 800*l.* odd in order to bribe Mr. Pigott, the author of the forged letters. Is it possible that they could

do more than that, and was it reasonable that they should be asked to do more than that? That covered the whole ground. Now, mark what the Land League did. Mr. Parnell at Edinburgh gave his audience to understand that the Land League had produced their cash-books, and that he (Mr. Parnell) had spent his time in searching for those cash-books until he found them. Unfortunately for Mr. Parnell he not only spoke at Edinburgh on Saturday, but he was examined before the Special Commission on Tuesday, and the evidence which the witness gave on oath affords the most curious and interesting commentary upon the speech of the new citizen in the Edinburgh Corn Exchange. It appeared, then—and everybody who reads the full account of the evidence on Tuesday morning will see that it is so—it appears, in the first place, that the Land League books were not produced, and that they have not been produced. It appears, in the second place, that Mr. Parnell knew, and has known for months, that they had not been produced. It appears, in the third place, that he had long suspected where they were—viz. in the possession of Mr. Egan—and it appears, in the fourth place, that he never wrote to Mr. Egan for the books himself; that he never asked Mr. Labouchere to write to Mr. Egan for the books himself; and that he never asked his solicitor, Mr. Lewis, to write for the books himself. And this is the man who gave the audience at Edinburgh to understand, amidst cheers, not only that the Land League books had all been produced, but that it was through his labours, forsooth, that the production of them had been secured. Mr. Parnell wishes to know who are the men—I read his exact words—who are the men of perjured, disreputable, and bad character through whose instrumentality the charges contained in ‘Parnellism and Crime’ were given to the world? Ladies and gentlemen, it requires no judicial commission to tell us who they were. The perjured, disreputable, and bad characters—at least, those so described by Mr. Parnell—the persons, at all events, who first gave those charges to the world—were Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Forster, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Trevelyan.”

Mr. Gladstone’s golden wedding was celebrated (July 26) by an address presented to him at the National Liberal Club. Among the prominent Liberal politicians who were present on the occasion were several Liberal Unionists, and but for a half-concealed allusion to Mr. Gladstone’s Irish proposals in the address, controversial politics—as dividing the two sections of the Liberal party—had no part in the proceedings. The address, which had been rendered a work of art by the co-operation upon it of several Academicians and other distinguished artists, did justice to Mr. Gladstone’s eminent services to the country; and his reply was in part an expression of his personal gratification, and in part a short reference to the triumphs of Liberal principles which he had himself witnessed.

Lord Randolph Churchill (*Paddington, S.*), who had maintained comparative silence since the controversy in the spring with reference to the seat for Central Birmingham, delivered two speeches in the Midlands. At Walsall (July 29) he spoke chiefly upon four topics, which he regarded as questions capable of local treatment. The first was the general question of the land. He thought that every municipality should have its land registry, by means of which transfers could be effected without much cost or delay. The law of primogeniture he would abolish by a single clause in an Act for the purpose, and the law of settlement by another clause. The better provision of artisans' dwellings was Lord Randolph's second topic. The third had reference to the licensing question, on which he spoke with much emphasis and candour. He thought that local authorities ought to have full control of public-house licences, and that if that control were given to them it "would result in an immense diminution and restriction of the drink traffic." Lord Randolph continued:—"What is the obstacle to this reform being carried into effect? The great obstacle undoubtedly is the wholesale manufacturers of alcoholic drink. Those manufacturers are small in number, but they are very wealthy. They exercise enormous influence. Every publican in the country almost, certainly nine-tenths of the publicans in the country, are their abject and tied slaves. Public-houses in nine cases out of ten are tied houses. There is absolutely no free will, and these manufacturers, these wholesale manufacturers of alcoholic drink, have an enormously powerful political organisation, an organisation which is so powerful and so highly prepared that it is almost like a Prussian army, it can be mobilised at any moment and brought to bear on the point which is threatened. Up to now this great class has successfully intimidated a Government and successfully intimidated members of Parliament; in fact they have directly overthrown two Governments, and I do not wonder, I do not blame Governments for being a little timid of meddling with them. But, in view of the awful misery which does arise from the practically unlimited and uncontrolled sale of alcoholic drinks in this country, I tell you my frank opinion—the time has already arrived when we must try our strength with that party. At any rate this Parliament has done some good. Although it did not succeed in entrusting local authorities with the duty of licensing, still it did undoubtedly establish this great principle—that the wholesale manufacturers of alcoholic drinks have no legal or moral title whatever which Parliament is prepared to recognise for compensation in the event of their industry being largely restricted. That was clearly decided, unmistakably decided, by the overwhelming opinion of the House of Commons last Session. I think, with respect to the retail trader, there was an equal agreement among all reasonable and moderate men that he did possess an equitable claim to compensation which should be met. This

was the opinion of Parliament, so strong that no Government ever dare fly in the face of it—that the big brewers and the big distillers are not entitled to one sixpence compensation in the event of reform of the licensing laws. But do imagine what a prodigious social reform, what a bound in advance we should have made if we could curb and control this destructive and devilish liquor traffic, if we could manage to remove from amongst us what I have called on former occasions the fatal facility of recourse to the beerhouse which besets every man and woman, and really one may almost say every child, of the working classes of England—if we could deviate from that drink and from the source of expenditure at any rate a considerable proportion only of the 100,000,000*l.* or more which this nation thinks it necessary at present every year to spend in drink, if we can deviate that expenditure to objects more civilised. I do not dwell further on the subject, but I do implore you all to think of it, to turn it over in your minds, and to recognise that it is the great social reform in this country which must be effected if you wish your country to remain strong, and if you wish your country to remain happy and to remain free.”

Lord Randolph Churchill's fourth topic was the labour question, suggested in part by the sweating system, and in part by the refusal of the Government to allow the British delegates at Berne to discuss the eight hours proposal. That refusal he condemned, while he urged that the labour question was one of the most pressing of the time. Addressing a public meeting at Birmingham on the following day (July 30), Lord Randolph made a significant allusion to the recent dispute in Central Birmingham. “You will probably before long,” he said, “have another electoral crisis, and I expect that that electoral crisis will terminate in another way.” In the course of a long dissertation on foreign affairs—the aspect of which he regarded as serious—he deprecated the continued indefinite occupation of Egypt by this country. In regard to Ireland Lord Randolph's tone was decidedly adverse to the policy of the Government. He would not concede the demands of the Parnellites, but he advocated a large measure of local self-government, and he deprecated evictions, the imprisonment of Irish members, and the dispersion of popular assemblies by the police. The landlords, he thought, should be bought out by the intervention of local bodies, who should be made primarily responsible for raising and paying the interest on the purchase money of the estates bought from the landlords and transferred to the tenants.

The customary Mansion House banquet to her Majesty's Ministers was given on July 31. The Prime Minister, in responding to the principal toast, after a short reference to the work of the Session and to the disturbances in Crete, made the following observations in regard to Egypt:—“The other point in which the horizon is somewhat disturbed is on the frontier of

Egypt; and again it is only the reflection of a past war, the recollection of the stupendous evils which followed Dervish activity in past times, that makes us look upon this matter as one of any importance. I had hoped that we should have been able to bring satisfactory news of the progress of that matter to this banquet; but at all events I think we may say that it is principally interesting in that it indicates the undoubted fact that the time has not yet arrived when England can leave Egypt to defend herself. It is a curious coincidence that almost at the time when the Dervishes were starting upon their mission to attack Egypt application was made to this country to take measures in the direction of leaving Egypt to herself, which could only be justified on the supposition that Dervish opposition had ceased to exist. We have had, not only from foreign parts, but from domestic advisers, suggestions that the time has come when we ought to abandon Egypt. Now, in respect to this matter as to others, it is important to remember that we are bound by our engagements, and that we have undertaken not to abandon Egypt or renounce our power of assisting her until she is capable of maintaining her own government in the face alike of domestic and foreign foes. That is an engagement which has been made repeatedly. Now, if you have put your name to a bill, it is not very interesting to inquire whether originally you can have value for the process through which you went, nor is it very useful for you to consider whether you cannot take a pen and strike through your name, because that operation might lead you to unpleasant places. The same is true of nations. We have come under this engagement with respect to Egypt. It is an engagement of which we have no reason to be ashamed. It is sanctioned by the highest considerations of honour, of philanthropy, of humanity; but it is an engagement which brings to us—I readily admit it—no immediate profit, no material profit, no profit except that which always attends the fulfilment of an honourable undertaking. But it is an engagement, be the consequences what they may, which England has undertaken, and which England assuredly will fulfil."

On the same evening (July 31) Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) presided at the annual dinner of the Liberal Union Club, which was held at Greenwich. In the course of his speech, in proposing the toast of "The Unionist Cause," he observed in reference to the Royal grants debates:—"What we have really been doing is settling the succession to the throne of the Home Rule party. But, as I have said, it does not matter in the least upon whom the choice ultimately falls or who is to have the honour of leading or of following the motley element of which this party is now compounded. We know perfectly well, whoever the leader may be, that the strings will be pulled by the new Radicals who have shown that they know their power and that they know how to use it. And if they use it,

who is there among the men who lead the Home Rulers who can resist it or restrict it? Not Mr. Gladstone; Mr. Gladstone only lately has made to these men an almost passionate and pathetic appeal, and it has been rudely brushed aside. Not Sir William Harcourt, whose sword is always at the service of the strongest faction. And certainly not Sir George Trevelyan nor Mr. Morley, who are 'reeds shaken by the wind,' and who yield to every gust of popular opinion. Under these circumstances I am inclined to imitate Mr. Burke, *longo intervallo* of course, and to make an appeal from the new Radicals to the old. I was brought up in the school of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden. Those great leaders of the people never for a moment hesitated to withstand the people whom they served when they thought they were in the wrong. Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden had one aim throughout their political career: it was to raise the social and intellectual condition of the masses of the people, and they resisted Constitutional change unless it could be shown directly to tend to these results. They would have been the first—they would have been in their lifetime the first—to condemn the efforts at unsettlement which are made by mischief-makers and mere hunters of notoriety."

The battle over the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, begun in the House of Commons, was resumed in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Bill (July 22), and on its being considered in Committee (Aug. 5), while it was also warmly taken up by the general public. The point in dispute was whether an exception should be made, in favour of employment in theatres, to the prohibition against the employment of children under ten years of age. On a motion by Lord Dunraven (Aug. 5) a proviso was added to the prohibitory clause, enacting that a court of summary jurisdiction might permit the employment of children under ten in places of amusement on its being satisfied that due provision had been made to secure the health and kind treatment of the children. This proviso was, however, amended on the motion of Lord Herschell, by limiting the discretion of the court to cases of children over seven years of age. The Bill was read a third time and passed Aug. 9. The Welsh Intermediate Education Bill and the Scotch Local Government Bill were passed on the same day. The Scotch Universities Bill was passed three days later (Aug. 12). None of these measures underwent material alteration.

A sentence of imprisonment for contempt of court, inflicted on Dr. Tanner (*Mul Cork*), was the occasion of a long debate in the House of Commons (Aug. 1). Mr. Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) contended that the sentence was unwarrantable, but Mr. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) pointed out that if it was so there was a means of getting it set aside. The remaining sittings during the Session were chiefly occupied with Civil Service Votes. Sir W. H. Dyke (*Kent, N.W.*), in moving the Education Vote (Aug. 5), the

amount of which was 3,684,389*l.*, stated that the number of scholars on the register was 4,687,000, and the average attendances 3,615,000, while the number of scholars passing in Standard IV. and higher was 953,000. The number of girls instructed in cookery was 42,159, as against 30,431 in the previous year, and the number of certificated teachers was 68,683, and pupil teachers 29,901. He regretted that it had been found necessary to withdraw the new education code, and insisted that its sole object was the general improvement of school life by making it more elastic and more popular. A long discussion followed, in the course of which Mr. Dixon (*Edgbaston*) pointed out the superiority of Board School education over that of the voluntary schools, which, he maintained, were in many ways unequal to the demands upon them. Lord Cranborne (*Lancashire, N.E.*) defended the voluntary schools, and complained that they had not received fair treatment from the Education Department, a charge which Mr. Mundella (*Sheffield, Brightside*) rebutted. The vote was eventually agreed to.

In the discussion on the Irish Constabulary Vote (Aug. 6) Mr. A. J. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) stated that owing to the improved state of the country the number of police in Ireland was smaller than in 1869-70, when crime was at an extremely low point. The debate extended over two sittings, and was brought to an end by the Closure, after an amendment for the reduction of the vote in respect of the cost of extra police and the pay of constables attending the Special Commission in London had been rejected. The vote was agreed to (Aug. 7) by 163 to 123. On the following day (Aug. 8), on the vote for County Court and other Irish officials, a violent scene took place while the Chief Secretary was speaking. Mr. E. Harrington (*Kerry, W.*) interrupted Mr. Balfour in an excited manner, and seemed about to leave his place and cross the floor of the House, but he was restrained by several members sitting around him, and induced to resume his seat. Among the other Irish votes, that for the Chief Secretary's office was warmly contested (Aug. 20 & 21), the opposition to the vote being met by an eloquent speech by Mr. Balfour (*Manchester, E.*) in vindication of the policy of the Government and his own acts.

The Technical Instruction Bill—a measure enabling local authorities to make a rate not exceeding a penny in the pound for the purposes of technical instruction—was read a second time (Aug. 14), after some opposition, the ground of objection to it being that the instruction was not to be given in elementary schools, while the Bill was not to be administered by School Boards. In Committee (Aug. 26 & 27) various amendments were moved with the object of curing these alleged defects, but they were resisted by the Government and rejected on division. The Bill was read a third time and passed (Aug. 28), and it passed the House of Lords on the following day.

The Indian Budget was not introduced till the last days of the Session. Sir J. E. Gorst (*Chatham*), in making the usual financial statement (Aug. 27), pointed to the improvement in the revenue in 1888-89 over that of 1887-88. The deficit in the latter year was Rx. 2,028,832, half of which, however, was mainly attributable to the conversion of India 4 per cent. stock, but the deficit for the year 1888-89 was only Rx. 698,000, considerably less than the original estimate. The estimated revenue for the current year showed an improvement of Rx. 587,000, resulting in a surplus of Rx. 603,300, which was made up of an increase in the revenue from land and opium, and an improvement in the rate of exchange. Salt had also contributed to the improvement, and he pointed out that the Government, by means of railways and canals and by opening up new salt sources, had lowered the cost of salt considerably more than the tax had raised it. Coming next to the question of expenditure, he mentioned that a committee had recently been investigating the expenditure of the Civil Departments, which had resulted in substantial economies, although he admitted that civil expenditure always had increased, and would, he hoped, continue to increase. The expenditure on the Army had also increased, and, with regard to the special defence works, Rx. 6,000,000 had already been spent exclusive of the expenditure on railways, and it was expected that a further outlay of Rx. 2,500,000 would be necessary before the works were completed. Sir J. Gorst then explained the system of provincial finance, and dealing in conclusion with the commercial condition of the country he showed that a large annual saving had been effected by the conversion of the Four per Cent. and Four-and-a-Half per Cent. stocks to Three-and-a-Half and Four per Cent. respectively, the saving in the former amounting to 266,600*l.* per annum. The exports last year were six and a half millions in excess of those of the previous year, while the imports showed an excess of four and a half millions. He concluded by moving to resolve:—

“That it appears by the accounts laid before this House that the total revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1888, was Rx. 78,759,744; that the total expenditure in India and in England charged to revenue was Rx. 80,788,576; that there was an excess of expenditure over revenue of Rx. 2,028,832; and that the capital outlay on railways and irrigation works was Rx. 2,784,824.” After a long discussion, in which Mr. Bradlaugh (*Northampton*), Sir R. Temple (*Worcestershire, S.*), and other Indian authorities took part, the resolution was agreed to.

On the third reading of the Appropriation Bill (Aug. 28), Mr. Sexton (*Belfast, W.*) complained of the low salaries earned by the Irish teachers in primary schools. He also complained of the unnecessary restrictions imposed on Roman Catholic schools, attended by no Protestant children, as regarded the use

of religious symbols, and remarked on the inadequacy of the provision for university teaching. The Chief Secretary (*Manchester, E.*) replied that the Irish people and not the State were to blame for the inadequate salaries of teachers. The contribution made by the State to the salaries of Irish head-masters was 64*l.*, and to those of head-mistresses 54*l.* per head, while the corresponding contributions in England were 57*l.* and 39*l.* respectively. As to university education, Mr. Balfour regretted that the Roman Catholic clergy had felt it their duty to discourage members of their Church from taking full advantage of the Queens Colleges or of Trinity College, Dublin. Regrets however, he admitted, were vain things, and the only course was to try to devise some scheme by which the wants of the Roman Catholic population should be met, other than those which at present had been attempted. He could not then, he said, suggest even the main lines of what the scheme ought to be, but that a scheme which should satisfy all the legitimate aspirations of the Roman Catholics ought to be carried out if possible he entertained no doubt. Mr. Balfour added that he hoped to be able to undertake some of the practical educational reforms he had suggested, but he could fix no definite time for them.

Mr. Balfour's speech was the occasion of a somewhat warm discussion. Mr. Parnell (*Cork City*) indicated a cautious approval, but Mr. Wallace (*Edinburgh, E.*) was sarcastically bitter about "the billings and cooings which had been going on between the Irish members and the Government," while Mr. E. Robertson (*Dundee*) declared that if the Irish members persisted in the opinions they had expressed, they would drive a very big wedge between themselves and the Radical party. This incident, perhaps one of the most noteworthy of the Session, was also one of the last. Parliament was prorogued Aug. 30.

A correspondence took place in July between Lord Rosebery and the Prime Minister on the subject of Imperial Federation. Lord Rosebery requested Lord Salisbury to receive a deputation from the Imperial Federation League, with a view to the summoning of a colonial conference in London, "to confer and report upon the possibility of establishing a closer and more substantial union between the mother country and the colonies." Lord Salisbury replied (July 23), expressing the readiness of the Government to receive any suggestions from the League, but adding that it was for the colonies to initiate any movement of the kind proposed by Lord Rosebery, if they desired that it should be undertaken. Lord Rosebery, in his answer (July 29), deprecated any action by the colonies otherwise than on the initiative of the Government. He reminded Lord Salisbury that the Queen's Speech in 1886 had declared that "there is on all sides a growing desire to draw closer in every practicable way the bonds which unite the various portions of the Empire." He also reminded him of a resolution moved five years before

by Mr. W. H. Smith, to the effect that "in order to avert disintegration, and to secure the permanent unity of the Empire, some form of federation is indispensable."

There was an almost entire absence of political speaking out of Parliament in the last month of the Session, but there was no lack of exciting incidents. The trial of Mrs. Maybrick for the poisoning of her husband at Liverpool, and the re-trial of the whole case in the newspapers and at public meetings after the verdict, were perhaps the chief matters which occupied the public mind. The visit of the German Emperor, however (Aug. 1-8), and the naval and military reviews in which he took part, were events of much interest, though the share of the general public in them was small. It was understood that the visit was a semi-private one. The Emperor was the guest of the Queen at Osborne, and he did not go to London. At a dinner at which he was entertained by the members of the Royal Yacht Squadron (Aug. 6.), his Majesty expressed his gratification at having witnessed a review of the finest fleet in the world. He remarked also that Germany had an army equal to her wants, and if the British nation had a fleet equal to its requirements, it would be regarded by Europe generally as a most important factor for the maintenance of peace.

Mr. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) was the solitary politician of eminence who discoursed on public questions at this period. He invited a number of his Unionist constituents—Liberal Unionist and Conservative alike—to his house at Highbury (Aug. 10), and delivered an address to them, in which he criticised with characteristic smartness the recent speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill at Birmingham and Walsall. "I observed the other day," he said, "that a most distinguished nobleman, Lord Randolph Churchill, addressed various speeches to audiences in Birmingham and the neighbourhood, and that he declared himself to be a Tory. I can only say his programme is a programme which, I am perfectly certain, will be absolutely repudiated by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour. I daresay you have often seen at a bazaar or elsewhere a patchwork quilt brought out for sale, which is made up of scraps from old dresses and from left-off garments which the maker has been able to borrow for the purpose. I am told that in America they call a thing of this kind a crazy quilt. I think that the fancy programme which Lord Randolph Churchill put before you the other day may well be described as a crazy quilt. He borrowed from the cast-off policy of all the extreme men of all the different sections. He took his Socialism from Mr. Burns and Mr. Hyndman; he took his local option from Sir Wilfrid Lawson; he took his Egyptian policy from Mr. Illingworth; he took his metropolitan reform from Mr. Stuart, and he took his Irish policy from Mr. John Morley. Is this Toryism?"

CHAPTER V.

The Dockers' Strike—Trades Union Congress—Mr. Chamberlain's Visit to Birmingham—Lord Hartington at Ilkley—Lord R. Churchill in Wales—The Welsh Church—The Liberal-Unionist Conference at Huddersfield—Mr. Gladstone on the pending Elections—The Bye-elections—The Unionist Campaign in Scotland—The Armenian Atrocities—The Cretan Insurrection and Foreign Affairs—The Unionists in the South-west—Sir William Harcourt at Carnarvon—Mr. Gladstone at Southport—Unionists and Liberals at Bristol—The Guildhall Banquet—Mr. Balfour at Ipswich—Mr. Goschen at Bristol and Swansea—The Strikes in London and Manchester—Mr. John Morley at the Eighty Club—Lord Rosebery and Sir George Trevelyan in Scotland—The Conservative Conference at Nottingham—Liberal Conference at Manchester—Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone—Mr. Goschen and Mr. Morley in Scotland—Mr. Parnell at Nottingham and Liverpool—State of Parties.

In spite of the invitation of certain well-intentioned philanthropists, Parliament wisely declined to intervene in the Dock Labourers' Strike, and when the Session closed the settlement of the dispute seemed as far off as ever. In many ways the situation was a novel one, and any interference between the parties might have aggravated a situation already acute. For almost, if not quite, the first time the representatives of the skilled workmen showed a readiness to throw in their lot with, and to support, unskilled labour in its struggle with the employers, and for quite the first time the sympathy of the middle-classes at home, and even in the Colonies, was with the men and against the masters.

It was on Tuesday (Aug. 13) that the great strike began in the South-West India Dock; but it was not until the Monday following that it extended to the Millwall, Victoria and Albert, and the Tilbury Docks, whilst on the South bank of the Thames the Surrey Commercial Dock labourers, who had no ground for complaint, remained at work until the Wednesday. According to the directors' view, it was evident that the strike had been carefully prearranged; but this opinion was not accepted by those who had followed the rise and progress of the Labourers' Union, which has for its secretary a working man, Benjamin Tillett. This society, during the past couple of years, had held meetings of protest against the hardship of the lot of the dock labourers, and in July a representation was made on their behalf to the Joint Committee of the London and India Docks—an authority which came into existence at the beginning of the present year, consequent upon the amalgamation of the principal dock companies of London. No redress of their grievances having been offered, the men, according to the secretary of the Joint Committee, sent a letter to the deputy-superintendent of the West India Dock one morning (Aug. 13), to which a reply was peremptorily demanded before noon of the same day; and as it was impossible to comply with the men's demands, the

strike commenced that afternoon. The strikers succeeded in enlisting the services of Mr. John Burns, a member of the London County Council, who was followed by others, but who declared that they had resigned their positions as such, in order to devote themselves to the labour movement as unpolitical and unbiassed friends of the workers. Very rapidly the area of disaffection spread, and the dock labourers appealed to, and succeeded in securing, the sympathy of the stevedores, a powerful body, and of the lightermen, some thousands in number, who joined them "on principle"; although the latter afterwards formulated demands of their own for shorter hours, at the old rate of pay. Many allied riverside trades followed suit, until the daily processions to the City included detachments of ballast-heavers, coal-whippers, ship-scrappers, sailors and firemen, boycotted bass-dressers, orange-porters, and many more beside, representing at that period, perhaps, a total of 40,000 to 50,000 strikers. Of this large number, according to the official statements, not more than 4,000 were genuine dock labourers belonging to the preference rank. Dock labour, as it existed until the beginning of August, was divided into three classes—the permanent men, few of whom went out; the preference men, who had the first call when a demand arose; and the casuals, or outside men, who were taken on only when necessary. The number of casuals employed varied from 5,000 to 15,000 daily, and they were recruited from the refuse of the unskilled labour market. They were paid at 5*d.* per hour, but the day's job might last half an hour merely. Their cause was, as already stated, espoused by all degrees of riverside labourers, and this combination brought about a complete deadlock to the trade of the Port of London; for the stevedores declined to load the ships, the lightermen to ply their barges, and the majority of the dock labourers to discharge vessels and to handle the goods in the warehouses. The strikers were supported by public opinion, and tacitly by the shipowners, who considered that they had a claim to the 6*d.* an hour, which was one of their principal demands. But, as the dock companies professed themselves unable to grant extra pay until their customers agreed to the imposition of higher charges, the Joint Committee made no concession on the vital point, although they very early in the controversy promised that every man engaged before noon should be paid 2*s.* as a minimum wage. The directors at first declined to give up contract work. The men meanwhile remained firm in their requests that they should be paid 6*d.* instead of 5*d.* an hour, with 8*d.* an hour overtime, and not less than four hours' employment, and they insisted that the tract system should be abolished.

For a long while the two parties were unable to come to a basis of settlement, and the condition of things in the Port of London was without a parallel, scarcely any work at all proceeding in the docks. Perishable cargoes had to be saved by

clerks and merchants, who worked as labourers; mail vessels were loaded by amateur stevedores, incoming boats were diverted to other ports, and 400 ships locked up in the docks were practically deserted. The dock companies, in spite of systematic picketing, did their best to fill the places of the absentees; but the labour was confined chiefly to the clearance of the import warehouses of goods claimed by their owners, and even this work was greatly impeded by the strike of the carmen, which happily lasted a few hours only. The coal-men in thousands also came out, and for a day or two it seemed that London would be deprived of coal, as well as of corn and of meat and other necessities of life. This danger, however, passed away, but not before deputations representing various departments of commerce had vainly urged upon the dock directors to relieve them of the existing strain. The Joint Committee sheltered themselves behind the plea that of the 70,000 strikers, the then estimated total, about 4,000 only were preference dockers, and with the rest they had nothing to do. That the struggle was in reality one between capital and labour at large appeared to be shown by the fact that the Strike Committee issued a manifesto calling upon all workers of every grade to "come out." This ill-advised appeal was very shortly afterwards withdrawn, but certainly it alienated for the moment a good deal of public sympathy. The Joint Committee took the extreme course of refusing to treat further with Messrs. Burns and Tillet as the representatives of the men, their advances having been declined. The labourers, however, scarcely wavered in their claims, and had never abated the demand for the 6*d.* an hour, except when their leaders submitted a tentative proposal which had been drawn up in conference with a section of the wharfingers, one part of which agreement stipulated for the payment of 4*s.* for 8½ hours' work. On the part of the Joint Committee, the directors met the views of the men in so far that, in addition to the concession of the 2*s.* minimum, they promised the substitution of a system of piecework for contract work, to be paid at 6*d.* an hour; but they steadily declined to pay the extra penny for casual labour. Accepting Mr. Norwood's estimate, the increase would have involved them in an extra outlay of 100,000*l.* per annum.

These proposals, put forward by Mr. Lafone (Sept. 4) were the subject of considerable discussion, and although grudgingly approved by the strikers, it was thought that had the dock directors accepted them, a resumption of work might have ensued. The preliminary negotiations, however, failed, and the Lafone compromise was not accepted, only by certain wharfingers and granary-keepers, who were thereby enabled to set to work about 7,000 men whose demands had been fully granted. At this juncture the shipowners pressed forward their solution of the difficulty. They desired to have the right of employing labourers to unload their vessels. The shipowners were confi-

dent that they could carry the system out with the support of the men, but the dock directors averred that the matter was so surrounded with difficulties that it could not be properly discussed until the strike was ended, and they begged Sir Donald Currie not to push his request. To everybody's surprise, the Joint Committee, however, suddenly fixed an early day for a discussion of this question, and the shipping world assumed that the strike would speedily end. In the meanwhile, the critical state of affairs had brought back to town the Lord Mayor, who, in conjunction with Cardinal Manning, the Bishop of London and others, at once took up the part of mediation. As the result of prolonged deliberation at the Mansion House, and believing themselves empowered by Messrs. Tillett and Burns, the Chief Magistrate and his colleagues laid before the dock directors (Sept. 17) a suggestion that the men should be conceded the only point which remained in dispute—the payment of the 6*d.*—but that the new scale should not begin until Jan. 1. This recommendation was accepted, but on the same day it was repudiated by the Strike Committee in a midnight manifesto. The men were evidently gaining heart from the influx of subscriptions, principally from Australia, and from the failure which had attended the efforts of the dock directors to obtain labour from the provinces. In no wise disheartened, the Lord Mayor, and more particularly Cardinal Manning, patiently re-discussed the various proposals. The chief objection raised by the men was the date fixed for the promised increased pay—the directors wishing to postpone it until the new year, and the men insisting upon its being granted from Oct. 1, before the Baltic trade was closed and the great wool cargoes were delivered. The dock labourers further declined to return to work until the claims which the lightermen had put forward on their own account had been satisfactorily settled. At length Cardinal Manning succeeded (Sept. 11) in persuading the Strike Committee to assent to the new rate of pay taking effect from the first Monday in November, but his Eminence was not equally successful in obtaining the assent of the dock directors. Public opinion, however, was so strongly in favour of the compromise, that the directors, after a slight show of hesitation, prudently accepted (Sept. 14) the conditions, and after five weeks' duration the great dock strike, which paralysed the trade of the Port of London, came to an end (Sept. 16). The loss entailed upon the dock companies, shipowners, and ship-charterers, was estimated at upwards of two millions sterling; whilst the damage done to the continued prosperity of the Port of London was incalculable. The eyes of the public were opened to the reckless extravagance with which dock accommodation had been extended without regard to the requirements of trade, and it was seen that the only chance of making a return to the shareholders was by keeping down the cost of labour to the lowest level. The dock labourers,

on their side, learnt the value of co-operation, and it was asserted that their Union, after the close of the strike, numbered 18,000 members. These in the future would receive the best and most regular employment, but the lot of the casual labourer would probably become more precarious and hopeless than ever.

As evidence of the extraordinary interest which the strike excited in classes and places not usually affected by trade disputes, it should be mentioned that, in addition to the large amount of relief distributed by the local lay and clerical agencies of the East End, the Strike Committee received from various sources upwards of 48,000*l.* Of this total not less than 30,800*l.* was contributed from Australia; by the British Trades Unions 4000*l.*, whilst the remainder was subscribed by sympathisers, chiefly amongst well-to-do classes. After all claims for relief had been satisfied, there remained a balance of 5,000*l.* in the hands of the Strike Committee. To a great extent, no doubt, the strikers deserved much of the sympathy bestowed upon them. In spite of the enormous number of men out of employ for so many weeks, often brought together in crowds to listen to exciting speeches, public peace was never disturbed. Picketing, it is true, was carried on at most of the dock gates in order to prevent the introduction of workers from the provinces and abroad; but, luckily, the authorities refused to allow the police to interfere on behalf of the directors, and this even-handed justice was recognised by the generally orderly conduct of the strikers.

Under these circumstances, it was natural that the proceedings of the Trades' Union Congress, held at Dundee (Sept. 3-7), should attract more than usual attention. The question there raised, however, concerned more immediately the hours of labour than the rate of pay. Mr. Ritchie, the chosen president, in his inaugural address dwelt at some length on the misery entailed by the unequal distribution of wealth, and the irregularity of employment. He wished working men to assert their claims more strenuously for a share in the general life of the nation, by winning more seats in parochial bodies, County Councils, and the House of Commons; and he heartily endorsed the action of the London Unions in extending their support, as representing the autonomy of labour, to the vast mass of unskilled and unorganised labour which lay outside them, and constantly tended to drag the labour market down to a lower level. The president went on to advocate the introduction of the eight hours rule, and even to regard with complacency the intervention of Parliamentary legislation to secure such limitation, on the ground, mainly, that a demand for the surplus labour of the country would thus be created. It was, however, obvious that on this point he was not supported by the majority of the Trades Unions, although they seemed in no wise desirous to make a public declaration of their views. Of the total number of workmen belonging to Trades Unions (about 885,000),

only thirty-three societies, representing less than 170,000, made any answer to the inquiries sent out from the central office; out of these, only 102,000 recorded their votes. The analysis even of this small faction was discouraging to those who wished for Parliamentary intervention in the matter; for whilst 39,629 voted in favour of eight hours a day, and 62,883 against it, only 28,489 of the minority were desirous of seeing the rule enforced by law. When, therefore, the question came up for discussion before the Congress, the question was shelved by 75 to 49. In another and less direct way the anti-Socialistic feeling of the majority found expression, when Mr. Broadhurst, M.P.'s resistance to legislative interference with the hours of trade was made the subject of a vote of confidence in that gentleman. A long and somewhat heated discussion, led by Mr. Keir-Hardie, took place, in the course of which it was insinuated by some of Mr. Broadhurst's opponents that he had been bribed by the enemies of the Trades Unions, whilst others, holding advanced Socialist views, opposed him on the ground of his moderation. The vote of want of confidence was nevertheless negatived by 177 to 11 votes. Some jealousy was displayed with regard to co-operation. So far as co-operation was distributive, the Congress did not feel called upon to express its opinion, but so far as it was productive, it behoved the Unions to watch it, and to take care it did not fall into the ordinary ways of capitalists, by employing labour without regard to any other consideration than cheapness. Amongst the other points discussed was that of the payment of members of Parliament, and a resolution in its favour was unanimously passed; but on the understanding that the payments were to be made, not by the members' constituents, but out of the public Exchequer.

Meanwhile political speeches were being made, in various parts of the country, by the Liberal Unionists, who desired above all things to keep themselves *en évidence*; and a little later by the Gladstonians, in obedience to their leader's advice that "the time is opportune for criticising in a free spirit the doings of the Government both in Ireland and elsewhere." Amongst the former, the address of Mr. Chamberlain to the Grand Committee of the Birmingham Liberal Unionist Association (Sept. 2) was the most noteworthy. He was able to congratulate that body on the success which had attended their efforts to popularise Liberal Unionism in the capital of the Midlands, and he looked forward with complacency to the completion of organisation by which he hoped to hold all the seven seats without the aid of the Conservative vote. He was, however, careful not to repudiate in any way the assistance he received from that party, and expressed his readiness to make concession of one or more seats to them, if they could show that their voters had a majority in the divisions. With this encouraging survey of the situation, he urged the Ward Committees to

further exertions, which would have to be maintained until after the next General Election. Turning then to general politics, he expressed his satisfaction that the question of Home Rule had for the moment receded to the background, and that the Government had shown their power to deal with some of the arrears of British legislation. He went on to point out that the tactics of the "Old Parliamentary Hand" had broken down, and that the administration of Ireland, contrary to Mr. Gladstone's anticipations, had had a most remarkable success. As for the Opposition—"They would have as many programmes as there are individuals among them. They are like a wrecked crew on a raft in mid ocean, and every man of them is trying to rig a juremast, and to fix to it his own ragged pocket-handkerchief, in the hope of catching, if it may be, a gust of popular favour." Looking to the future of Ireland, Mr. Chamberlain said they would have to deal first with the land question, and after that with local government. For the first, his principle was single ownership without risk to the British taxpayer; but, instead of introducing a Bill on which they must stake their existence, the Government should submit their proposals to the House of Commons in the form of resolutions, and benefit by the criticisms afforded them. If the land question were settled, the conflict of interests would have disappeared, and any abuse of the privileges conferred by local government could be met by provisions for an appeal to a high judicial tribunal. Coming next to the question of higher education, he said he was amused at the cry of alarm at Mr. Balfour's declaration from two Scotch Home Rulers who had accepted the principle of governing Ireland according to Irish ideas. They of the old Birmingham Education League had advocated the principle that education, so far as it was national, should be secular; but if higher education in England or Scotland could be shown to be denominational and supported by the State, there was a just claim to be set up for equality of treatment by the majority of the population. If Protestants were not willing to surrender denominational education in this country, he could not see how they could object to Roman Catholics who demanded denominational endowments in Ireland. Remarking that it would be premature to discuss this question at length until they had the Government proposals before them, he admitted he was willing to give Ireland equality of privilege with England and Scotland. On these three matters there was a policy which would remove the most pressing and material grievances of Ireland, and the Gladstonians could not refuse to treat these proposals on their merits. Vindicating again the Unionist policy, Mr. Chamberlain concluded by appealing once more, not only to the interests, but to the pride and patriotism of Englishmen.

It was obvious that the frankness with which Mr. Chamberlain spoke of the approaching independence of his party of Con-

servative support would give rise to unpleasant reflections in various quarters. In order, therefore, to remove these impressions, Lord Hartington, in his speech at Ilkley (Sept. 7), dwelt at length on the benefits which had resulted from the Unionist alliance, and were traceable in the improved condition of Ireland and in the satisfactory legislation of the previous Session. Looking forward to the future, he declared that it was no longer necessary for the Unionist party to remain on the defensive, but that the time was come for them to adopt a constructive, if not an altogether distinctive, policy, and for Unionist members to explain the nature and scope of the legislative and administrative reforms they were prepared to introduce or support. As for the position which the Gladstonians would probably take up in their speeches during the recess, Lord Hartington remarked, "They will ignore, carefully and studiously ignore, the improvement which has taken place in Ireland, and its prosperous condition. They will endeavour to concentrate the whole attention of the public upon a few deplorable facts, such as that it has been found necessary still to proceed by a process of law, and to the extent of imprisonment in some cases, against popular members of Parliament and popular leaders of opinion in Ireland. They will altogether ignore the fact that, regrettable and deplorable as we all deem the necessity of these proceedings to be, they have been attended with compensating advantages. They will ignore the fact that, in the diminution of agrarian crime, in the cessation of tyrannical processes of intimidation and boycotting, an immense amount of human suffering has been saved." Addressing a large gathering of Unionists later in the day, Lord Hartington declared the Unionist alliance to be existing in full force, and to be stronger now than when it was formed, three years back. The two parties to the alliance could, it was found, agree upon other matters besides those affecting the Union or the Government of Ireland. He did not agree with those who said that the time had arrived when the alliance should become a fusion of the two parties. The alliance had, for practical purposes, worked well, and he did not think it would be wise to change its form; but he could not doubt that all that was taking place from day to day—the common labours in which they were engaged, the common interests which they were learning to uphold and defend—was laying the foundation for the formation, at some not very distant time, of a still greater national party, which should know no other bonds than the bond of devotion to Imperial interests, and the bond of common effort to elevate the condition of our countrymen all over the United Kingdom. He denied that the question at issue between the two great political parties was one between "the classes" on one side and "the masses" on the other; and he went on to argue that it was a question which ought not to be, even if it could be, solved by a single decision of a bare majority of any portion of the people. He showed that

even in so free and popularly-governed a country as the United States, so much importance was attached to the permanence and stability of their constitutional institutions, that no change whatever could be made in the Constitution except by a careful and protracted process. It required a majority of two-thirds of the Congress even to propose such changes; and even then they could not be carried without an appeal to, and confirmation by, three-fourths of the people, consulted in each individual and separate State. In this country we had no such safeguard as had been thought necessary by the framers of the American Constitution, and we ought to take example in such a matter from America. That example justified and compelled the Unionists, if ever they should, unhappily, find themselves a minority defending the Constitution, to use every resource and every effort in or out of Parliament to prevent such wide and sweeping changes from being made.

The *Daily News* saw in this speech, which the other papers described as most statesmanlike, the admission that Lord Hartington and his friends would, at the next election, "ride for a fall," and that he was preparing his party for the recognition of their certain defeat. On the other hand, it was urged that the object of the speech was to lay the foundations of a National party—knowing no bond—to be composed of the existing Conservatives and those of the Liberal Unionists who might decline to reunite themselves to the Home Rule party.

By a strange coincidence, another leader, who had the least possible sympathy with the Liberal Unionists, and was cordially distrusted by them, was simultaneously speaking on the question of the hour. Lord R. Churchill, at Newtown, Montgomeryshire (Sept. 6), undertook the apparently hopeless task of impressing upon Welshmen a sense of gratitude for the benefits they had received from Tory rule. Admitting that the Conservatives in Wales were in a minority, he saw no reason why they should continue to be so. Since 1860 the Principality had returned to Parliament a large majority of Radical members, and Mr. Gladstone and his friends had been in office for the greater part of the time; yet, in spite of circumstances apparently so favourable to Wales, no special attention had been given by the Liberal party, when in power, to Welsh grievances and Welsh wants. The one solitary service which the Liberal party had rendered to Wales during all those years had been the settlement of the burials question. During the last Session of Parliament, however, a very different state of things had been brought about. Though an overwhelming Unionist majority, on which Wales had no claim, had been in power, Welsh grievances and requirements had received a more careful recognition than had been the case in any Parliament of former years. Even Mr. Rendel, a thorough Radical, had admitted, in a recent speech, that the Session of Parliament which had just closed had been more important to Wales

than any Parliament which had ever existed. Lord R. Churchill then went on to show that during the session the fact had been recognised for the first time by statute that Monmouthshire was part of Wales, and it had also been laid down for the first time by the Interpretation Act that "when England was used in the statute it was not to be taken to include Wales, and that in future statutes Wales must be separately mentioned." It was also to a majority in a Tory Parliament that Wales, together with England, owed popular representative local government in the rural districts—a question with which the Liberal party had trifled for years. Though the tithes question was not yet settled, it was upon the point of settlement; and if there had been any neglect in dealing with it the Radical party must be held largely responsible. The Tithes Bill, which it would be the first duty of Parliament to take up in the ensuing Session, would make the tenant farmer no longer responsible for the payment of tithes, would make the landlord solely responsible, and would give to the county court the power, under certain conditions, to assess fairly the tithes which might be due, and to remit them altogether in cases where the land could not be fairly held to have earned a tithe at all. Lord R. Churchill next dealt with the reception which had been given to the political programme which he recently put forward in speeches delivered in the midland counties. He had been assailed for expressing Radical, Communistic, and Socialistic views; but he demurred to this criticism on the ground that in all he advanced he said absolutely nothing new or original. There were two kinds of reform—organic and social—and while he would always offer the most strenuous opposition to the first, he had always held that in the second the Tory party might and ought to do active work. Organic reform would arrest and put back popular progress; but social reform, if wisely taken in hand, must materially advance popular happiness. The improvement of the condition of the people was the province of reform which the Tory party ought to annex; and he found that the condition of the people was most seriously and dangerously affected by two great evils—first, the excessive consumption of alcoholic liquors, and, secondly, the disgraceful condition of the dwellings inhabited by a large portion of our labouring population. These two evils were producing a most exuberant, rank, and noisome crop of poverty, misery, disease, and crime. Lord Randolph went on to repeat his old argument that licensing was a part of local government, and that the liquor traffic should be left in the hands of the County Councils. In the same way he once more contended that the question of the housing of the poor should be dealt with by the municipalities and County Councils, who should simply be forced by some motive power to do the duty in this respect which the law already imposed upon them. He denied that his views on either of these points were at all Socialistic. As to the labour question, he denied that he had ever

advocated an Eight Hours' Bill. All he had done had been to declare that the labour question was within the domain of social reform. Finally, the noble lord addressed himself to Irish affairs, and urged that the Unionist party should redeem their pledges to establish popular local government in Ireland, and to abolish the dual ownership of land by promoting some scheme for buying out the remaining rights of the landlords. But he warned the country that no scheme of land purchase could be satisfactorily worked which did not involve a large and liberal use of State credit. He protested against the charges of inconsistency and insincerity which had been brought against him, and maintained that no one could have given a greater proof than he had done of the sincerity of his views when, because he did not altogether approve of the policy of the Government of which he was a member, he resigned almost the highest office in the State.

On the following day (Sept. 7), at Plás Machynlleth, Lord R. Churchill grappled with skill and force the still more thorny question of Welsh disestablishment. He declared that to the disestablishment of the Church, whether in Wales, in Scotland, or in England, the Tories were bound to oppose an inflexible resistance. That was a cardinal point of Tory principle which admitted of no compromise or modification, and which was essential to the life and the honour of the Tory party. But was Wales, then, for ever to be alienated from the Tory party? He thought not, supposing they could prove, as they would prove, that they had the will and the power to legislate generously and sympathetically for Welsh interests in all secular matters. The Church in Wales was not an alien Church, and therefore was not open to the heavy reproach brought against the Established Church in Ireland. It was a Welsh Church—a national Church—and the history of Wales and that of her Church were inseparable. They were of equal antiquity, and in the time of the Tudors not only did the Church emancipate the Welsh people from the errors and the servitude of Rome, but the Episcopate defended with unflinching purpose Welsh customs, literature, and law. The peace of Wales did not depend, as the peace of Ireland was said to depend, upon disestablishment; and, while the minority formed by the Irish Church was stationary or diminishing, the case was entirely different in Wales, where, before another generation had passed away, the Church would have enormously increased her popular strength, and would, perhaps, largely, if not altogether, have removed the disparity of numbers between herself and her opponents. Many of the Nonconformists in Wales regarded the Established Church with favour, and another large section regarded it with toleration. The differences and difficulties between the Church and the Nonconformists in Wales were far more ritualistic than dogmatic, and, though the Church was endowed, it was by no means over-endowed, for her endowments did not exceed a quarter of a million a year. It was only by means of

her endowments that the Church was enabled, not only to be independent in a good and proper sense of the word, but to be the Church of the poor, and of the very poor. If the Church were disendowed, no one could say that the Nonconformists were prepared, in the teeming populations of the urban districts, to answer adequately to the call which voluntaryism was compelled to make upon its supporters, and ready to fill the great religious vacuum which must necessarily be created. The majority of the Welsh people had by no means pronounced their voice on this question; and even Mr. Gladstone would only say about it, not that he would support disestablishment in Wales, but that it was "ripe for Parliamentary discussion." He concluded his speech by ridiculing the idea of a Welsh Parliament, which he described as "a vestry for the parish of Wales," and by urging that what Wales sought was not "a spurious nationality, which would dishonour an ancient race," but only such nationality as was compatible with the real greatness and unity and integrity of the great empire of which she formed part.

Lord R. Churchill was generally credited with having made a bold bid for the support of Welsh people, and not to have attempted to hoodwink them as to the attitude of Tory Democrats towards the Established Church. The *Times* readily threw in its lot with the Conservative ex-leader, declaring that the English and Welsh Churches were one, and must stand and fall together. The *Daily News* naturally viewed with some scepticism Lord Randolph's assurance that the Tories in England, Wales, and Scotland would oppose to disestablishment an inflexible resistance. "On that question," said the speaker, "the Tory party sounded no uncertain sound." "We should be sincerely glad," wrote the *Daily News*, "if we could think that there was any question on which the Tory party sounded no uncertain note." Far more important, however, was the view of the Welsh themselves, and the majority of their organs showed little disposition to swallow the bait held out. The general tone of the local papers was thus expressed in the *South Wales Daily News*: "Instead of speaking such rubbish about the attitude of the Welsh people to the Church Establishment as Tory speakers generally indulge in, it would be much more to the purpose to explain how it is that candidates for parliamentary honours have no chance whatever in most Welsh constituencies unless they are prepared to vote for disestablishment. On another point Lord Randolph gave evidence of his utter ignorance of the whole subject. We refer to his observation that, by reason of its endowments, the Anglican Church in Wales was enabled to be essentially the Church of the poor. If this be true, how are we to account for the fact that it is really the Church of the rich, and that the poor have deserted it? It is mainly among the rich, the landowners, and squires, that we find the kind of people who prefer to worship at other people's expense. The poor carry

their mites—the scrapings of their hard earnings—to their own Nonconformist sanctuaries, leaving the wealthier portion of the community to get their spiritual nourishment provided for them out of funds which belong to rich and poor alike. We hope that the next time Lord Randolph Churchill visits Wales he will decline the hospitality of the big people, and go into the crowd with open eyes and with a disposition to accept facts. If he will only put himself to this possible inconvenience, he will very probably change his opinions, and be prepared to speak on the question of disestablishment with the authority of a man who has made use of his own senses and faculties, and not reposed implicit confidence in a class who know as little about the thousands of Welsh people as they know about the North Pole.”

The case for the Church in Wales was, however, treated with great fulness at the Church Congress at Cardiff a few days later. The discussion was opened by Mr. J. T. D. Llewelyn, who had stood at the General Election as the Conservative candidate for the town, and had announced his intention of again offering himself on the next occasion. He dwelt briefly on the rise and development of the Church in Wales, but scarcely touched upon the real causes which had led to its unpopularity and loss of influence—points on which the Dean of Llandaff spoke frankly and without reserve. Mr. Llewelyn prefaced his remarks by saying that enemies of the Church in Wales described it as an “alien” Church, and stated that it was forced upon the Welsh people by the English Government. Such assertions were utterly groundless. On the contrary, it was universally admitted by ecclesiastical authorities that a Christian Church had existed in Wales from the early days of Christianity, and that it was in full working order when St. Augustine arrived in England. The Welsh Archbishopal see was removed from Caerleon to St. David’s in the sixth century, for the more peaceful and effective discharge of the duties of the Metropolitan. Previous to the days of the Reformation, they had a list of between fifty and sixty Bishops of Llandaff, and while the interference of Rome was strongly resented, a genuine union with the English Church was not accepted until a prince of Welsh extraction occupied the throne, in the person of Henry VIII. The House of Tudor encouraged the Welsh Church, appointed Welshmen to the sees and benefices; and their example was followed by the Stuarts. The Church flourished, and Welshmen rose to eminence in the State. The Bible was translated into Welsh by Bishop William Morgan, who was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff in 1595, and translated to St. Asaph in 1601. But with the Revolution came an evil day for the Welsh Church. A new method of governing Wales was adopted. The Welsh language was condemned, and Englishmen were appointed to Welsh sees and benefices, who were mainly non-resident. What was known as the revival of religion in Wales was the work of pious clergymen of the Church of England in the early part of

the last century, who saw the deplorable condition into which the common people had sunk by reason of the neglect of the ordinary ministrations of the Church in their native tongue, and who were fired with zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Griffith Jones, Howell Harris, Daniel Rowlands, and Thomas Charles—the founders of Methodism—were members of the Church of England. These good men never thought of separating themselves from the Church, but intended solely to revive religion within its fold. The people were enjoined to attend their parish churches, and observe her sacraments. When the English Government adopted a change of policy towards Wales, some fifty years ago, the Church revived, and the people gradually responded to her call. It was at this period that the Liberation Society was formed, whose action was largely governed by the activity and success of the Church. From that time the progress of the Church had been uninterrupted, and growing in strength and influence year by year. The following statistics showed the rapid strides the Church has made: In 1831 there were 700 clergy, ministering in 847 parishes; in 1888 there were 1,484 clergy, ministering in 987 parishes. There were spent on church restoration and building from 1840 to 1874—On cathedrals, 114,219*l.*; churches, 1,301,972*l.*; in one single year (1884), 107,000*l.* From 1851 to 1885, 353 churches were built or enlarged. In the ten years from 1877 to 1886 there were 65,284 persons confirmed. The ratio had largely increased in the last three years. In some parishes it had increased 400 per cent. The proportion of communicants to the population was greater in Wales than in England. The Election of 1885 was fought on the question of disestablishment, and the result was as follows, four constituencies being uncontested: For disestablishment, 98,593; against, 67,560—showing a ratio of three Nonconformists to two Churchmen. The burials, perhaps, showed more truly than any other test the true sentiment of the Welsh people towards the Church of their forefathers. No complete returns had been made for the whole Principality, but it was ascertained in 1886 that in 272 parishes in North Wales there had been, since the passing of the Burials Act in 1880, 1,441 funerals under the Act, and 20,598 by the clergy of the Church. The general conclusion, from the foregoing figures, was that Welshmen voted for the Church and attended the religious worship in the Church as two to three; while twenty to one sought the rites of the Church and the services of the clergy in the hour of death. In the matter of marriages the proportion in 1881 was: Church, 4,150; chapel, 2,198; registrar's office, 3,870. Naturally, considering the occasion, no arguments on the side of disestablishment were put forward, but the need of legislative and internal reforms was generally admitted.

The next important demonstration of the Liberal Unionists

was made at Huddersfield (Sept. 17) on the occasion of the annual conference of the National Liberal Union. Lord Selborne, for many years Mr. Gladstone's Lord Chancellor, put forward in a clear form the practical benefits which had resulted to the Irish from the steady enforcement of law. He was followed by Mr. Chamberlain, who made an earnest appeal to the "moderate Gladstonians" to consider whether, after all, the change of front which three years before had shattered the Liberal party might not have been a serious blunder, hastily conceived and imprudently executed. He asked them to explain the nature of the new creed which they had adopted: in that way they might help him to "find salvation." The Liberal Unionists' policy was clear. Having maintained the law successfully, they were proceeding to the next stage, to the remedial policy which before 1885 was the demand of the whole Liberal party. While he predicted that this would be carried successfully, he admitted that its effects in Ireland would be greater if it could secure the support of the moderate men of all parties. If a Parliament were established in Dublin, it would proceed at once to deal with the land question, with the question of local government, and with the question of education, and to promote the material and industrial resources of the country. Why should not the Imperial Parliament do this? It was willing to do so, and but for obstruction would do it quickly. When it was said that Gladstonians were not in favour of coercion it was a mistake, for it was part of their principles to use whatever force was necessary to resist the concession to Ireland of complete independence. The only difference between Gladstonians and Unionists was as to whether the point had been reached at which coercion ought to be applied. The Unionists contended that if Home Rule were granted separation would be made possible, easy, and inevitable. While Gladstonians regarded separation as a dishonour and disaster to the country, they appeared willing to recognise the nationality of Ireland.

"Have you ever thought what the recognition of a separate nationality in Ireland means? A separate nation has the right to choose its own form of government; it has the right not only to make its own laws, but to collect its own revenues, and to make its own tariff. It has the right to control its foreign relations with other countries; it has the right to establish, if it pleases, a Church of its own; it has the right to create and maintain a military force both for defence and offence. Those are the rights of a nation. There is not one of those rights which has not already been claimed for Ireland by the Irish Nationalist leaders. We do not hear of any repetition of the claim, but I do not believe that it has been withdrawn by a single one of them. Whether it be withdrawn or not, it is as clear as the day that when you create an Irish National Parliament that Parliament will not rest—I will go further, and say they ought not

to rest—until they extort from your fears or from your weaknesses every one of those rights which logically reside in a nation, and which will be in themselves reasons for its own existence. . . . If, on the contrary, Ireland is only a portion of the greater nation; if it be identified and associated with the glories of Great Britain by its history, by its common interests, and by its geographical position; if the order and peace of the smaller country and the security of the greater country alike depend upon their union—then I say one Parliament, and one Parliament alone, must bear supreme and unquestioned authority in the United Kingdom.”

Finally, Mr. Chamberlain said that Gladstonians never faced the question of civil war. For Ulster would refuse to submit herself to a Dublin Parliament, and in her refusal she would have the sympathy of hundreds of thousands of the Protestant population in the south and west of Ireland. But the policy of silence had been played out. The British people had a fund of common sense, and were not to be overcome by mere sentiment and rhetoric. They would not, he urged, be led by side issues to a vast constitutional change which would break the continuity of our history, which would alter our relations with foreign Powers, and which would enforce a change of the details of our home Government and administration.

On the following day (Sept. 18) Mr. Chamberlain closed his campaign by a still more important speech, in which he dwelt upon the enormous danger which the failure of a Home Rule policy, if once conceded, would create. He ridiculed the idea of “falling back upon the superior strength of England,” which was the only solution suggested by the Gladstonians. To attempt the reconquest of Ireland would prove a very serious business—it was a policy which had failed in the American colonies when they had only 2,000,000 of population; and in the Transvaal with only 40,000 inhabitants. Home Rule once accorded, the step would be practically final; and this outcome it behoved the Gladstonians to face. Mr. Chamberlain next endorsed warmly Lord Hartington’s expression of belief that the Unionists and Conservatives would ultimately be fused into a National party. Mr. Chamberlain declared that not even to save the Empire would he call himself a Tory, nor would the Tories call themselves Liberals. Some such arrangement was rendered the more necessary by the disorganisation of the Opposition. “The centre of gravity of the Gladstonian party was in its tail, and the head had lost all power and all vigorous contributing energy.” It was “blossoming into all kinds of inconceivable political heresies,” preaching resistance to law, coquetting with socialism, depreciating patriotism. The new party, of which Mr. Chamberlain foresaw the rise, “would be,” he said, “as far removed from those new doctrines of Radicalism as it would be from the old fossil Toryism of the past.”

If the conference of the Yorkshire Unionists served no other purpose, it offered the basis of a possible agreement between two parties which had hitherto been hopelessly at variance; but Mr. Chamberlain failed to show how the mass of the people, who knew no political distinctions other than Liberal and Conservative, Radical and Tory, blue and buff, would understand, or follow with enthusiasm, a combination of which the emblem was a neutral tint.

The only noteworthy speech on the Liberal side was from its leader, Mr. Gladstone, who took the opportunity (Sept. 23) afforded by the visit of congratulation (on his golden wedding) paid by the Hyde Reform Club to touch generally upon the political situation. The lesson which he drew from the London strike was, that a large number of separate trades having little or nothing to do with each other had shown that they intended to make common cause. This lesson Mr. Gladstone thought the leaders had learnt from Ireland, where the people, hitherto dis-united, had, thanks to coercive laws, been compelled to associate for an object which they believed to be vital to all. The competition of labour and capital was not, he considered, hostile—it was a balance of force, and this strike indicated some turn of the balance in favour of labour. He laughed at Mr. Chaplin, as an impotent Protectionist who found it desirable to say that, though he was a Protectionist, he had “no intention of acting upon Protectionist principles”; and Mr. Gladstone reminded his hearers that it was “the common practice of a swindler, when the country was too hot to hold him, to take an *alias*,” and Protectionists now called themselves either “Fair-traders” or “Bi-metallists.” Fair-trade was Protection which did not dare to show its face, and bi-metallism was an expedient to raise prices. Mr. Gladstone twitted Mr. Chaplin with his hostility to the granting of allotments, and then went on to discuss the Government declaration on the question of an Irish Roman Catholic University. It was important to ask what it was that the Government really meant to do in the matter, for a letter, apparently written by Mr. Balfour, had just been published, in which the Chief Secretary declared that, “though he desired to promote the higher education of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, the foundation and endowment of a university for that purpose had never been in contemplation.” If that was authentic, it was, in Mr. Gladstone’s opinion, “the shabbiest of all the shabby proceedings of which this Government had been guilty.” The original announcement of the Government was now reduced to this—that they desired to promote the higher education of the Roman Catholic population. But everybody desired that, and Mr. Gladstone himself was of opinion that the Roman Catholics had not yet got justice in Ireland. The mountain had shrunk into a mouse, and an announcement which was to have split the Liberal party seemed to “end in a truism to

which the whole population of the country, Roman Catholic and Protestant, must alike assent." As in Mr. Balfour's letter the word "university" was said to be underlined, it might be that the intention of the Government was this—that though they did not intend to endow out of British funds a Roman Catholic university, they did intend to endow a Roman Catholic college. On this point Mr. Chaplin, who was now a Cabinet Minister, should be asked for explanations. Mr. Gladstone then called attention to one remarkable point in the conduct of the Liberal Unionists, whom he described as the extremest of the adversaries of the Opposition—their readiness to sink all secondary questions, and to keep only the one primary question, the maintenance of the Union, in view—a readiness which prompted them to vote against the Opposition, even on unquestionably Liberal proposals, or to abstain from voting altogether. He maintained that a party "should not be ashamed to receive instruction from their adversaries," and he therefore recommended the Liberal electors of Elgin and Nairn, some of whom were dissatisfied with their candidate, Mr. Keay, because he was in favour of the nationalisation of land, to "sacrifice the secondary for the sake of the primary." The nationalisation of the land, if it meant the plunder of the proprietors, was "robbery"; and if it meant the giving of compensation, was folly, because the State was not qualified to exercise the functions of a landlord, and would be over-burdened and broken down in the attempt. The main point at the present moment was the Irish question, for until it was settled the English character would never be redeemed from the dishonour attaching to 700 years of misgovernment, and the English people would never have the free use of their own Parliament, which was a vital matter to them.

Mr. Gladstone's speech was regarded—as, doubtless, it was intended to be—as an electioneering address, for at this moment there was an unusually large number of vacant seats. The results, however, showed that all these speeches, Gladstonian and Unionist, delivered from a distance, had really little effect upon the majority of the electors. A day or two after Mr. Gladstone's speech, Mr. Chaplin, who, on accepting the post of Minister of Agriculture, had vacated his seat, was re-elected (Sept. 26) for the Sleaford division of Lincolnshire, by practically the same majority as that by which he had been returned in 1885. Nor was the effect of the Unionist campaign more apparent, for at Dundee no attempt was made by the Unionists to contest the seat vacant by the death of Mr. J. F. Bottomley Firth, Deputy-Chairman of the London County Council, and it fell to the editor of the leading local journal, Mr. Leng. For Elgin and Nairn, Mr. Seymour Keay, who, with regard to "nationalisation of the land," and various other advanced views, proclaimed himself a disciple of Mr. H. George, was elected (Oct. 8) by a large

majority over the Liberal Unionist, Mr. Logan, who, however, occupied the most invidious and difficult position for a popular candidate, that of agent to the chief landowner in the district. Neither of these seats in any way altered the balance of parties in the House; but south of the Tweed the Liberal Unionists were less fortunate, for at Peterborough (Oct. 7) their candidate, Mr. Robert Purvis, who was supported by the Fitzwilliam interest, was defeated by 251 votes, on a register on which, in 1886, the Unionists showed a majority of 289. Following close upon the heels of this victory, the Gladstonians scored a further success in North Bucks, where their candidate, Captain Verney, polled 4,855 votes against 4,647 given to the Conservative, Hon. Evelyn Hubbard, the brother of the outgoing member, who had succeeded to his father's peerage. In 1886, Captain Verney had been defeated by the narrow majority of 71, upon a considerably smaller poll, although in 1885 he had been returned by a majority of more than 1,400 over his Conservative opponent. Numerous causes were put forward to account for this change of views on the part of the electors. The losers naturally did their utmost to minimise the effect of bye-elections in general, although when, a few days later (Oct. 25), Mr. Gerald Loder carried the seat at Brighton by a largely-increased majority (as compared with 1885) against Sir Robert Peel—who stood as a Gladstonian—the Unionists were anxious to emphasise their expression of public opinion. Both parties, however, seemed to leave out of account the obvious fact that, the greater the majority obtained by one side at a general election, the more numerous are the opportunities offered to the minority to win back seats at bye-elections. Not only is the field wider, and the choice greater, but there is the natural instability of all political opinion—as seen in democracies—to be taken into account.

Whilst the battalions had been thus engaged in open conflict, the leaders were haranguing their followers far away from the various battlefields. In the extreme South-west, speaking to his constituents at Liskeard (Sept. 25), Mr. L. Courtney defended the course which he and his friends had taken in showing their sense “of the levity with which Mr. Gladstone had made his Home Rule proposals, which threatened to change radically the constitution of the United Kingdom. He expressed very great doubt as to the value of the verdict given by the eighty-five Parnellite members, returned by constituencies in which one-half of the voters were illiterates; and on the subject of the latest official version of the Home Rule scheme, he declared his ignorance of how and when the judgment of the country had been expressed in favour of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, whilst it was notorious that many of Mr. Gladstone's adherents regarded their total withdrawal from Westminster as a necessary condition of Home Rule. Whilst generally defending the policy of the Ministry, he admitted that they had

made some mistakes, notably in the case of the Sugar Bounties and the Catholic University for Ireland. But in both instances they had had the wisdom to retreat from a false position. With regard to the Catholic education question, Mr. Courtney admitted that if the Parliament at Westminster, whether out of deference to Irish prejudices or not, began doing the very things which many of the Unionists distrusted, then the reasons for opposing Home Rule would cease to exist. If those at Westminster attempted to do the thing which they would not allow an Irish Parliament to do, they would lose their mainstay and safeguard, and would abandon the only defence behind which they were irresistible.

At the opposite end of the kingdom—at Hexham—Mr. Courtney's former colleague, Sir George Trevelyan, gave (Sept. 28) a very different view of the situation, and eagerly denied that the Liberals were pursuing a revolutionary or dangerous policy. They were pursuing a course which could be defended on the grounds of justice and justified on the grounds of reason; and though the Liberals were few in the House of Commons, there never was a time when, within so short a space of years, so many serious evils had been averted by the action of a political party. He recommended that the party should now endeavour to obtain the passing of a better Registration Law, and he proceeded to comment at some length on the Irish question; but here he only travelled over familiar ground, and had nothing fresh to advance by way of argument or illustration.

But these September speeches were, after all, little more than skirmishes and reconnaissances in view of the Autumnal campaign. Whether by accident or design, the rival factions began operations with what looked like an organised plan, the Unionists taking the north, and the Gladstonians the south, of the kingdom—in fact, each attempting to storm the strongholds of the adversary. Lord Hartington, Lord Randolph Churchill, and Mr. Chamberlain appeared in rapid succession at Aberdeen, Newcastle, Perth, and Stirling; whilst Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Labouchere respectively attacked Salisbury and St. Leonards-on-Sea. In each case the speakers met with a warm and flattering reception, and possibly, had an election followed their visits, the effects of their eloquence might have been traceable at the polls; but as this test was wanting in each case, its permanent influence upon political thought and feeling could not be gauged. The most novel incident of the campaign was Lord Hartington's attack at Aberdeen (Oct. 2) upon the personal influence exercised by Mr. Gladstone, "the late leader of the Liberal party, the present leader of the Home Rule party." After a full acknowledgment of Mr. Gladstone's "earnestness, his wide sympathies, his public spirit, his unrivalled gift of eloquence," Lord Hartington ventured to express doubt whether "an extraordinary dialectical power and command of language, which enabled him

to speak with almost equal force upon either side of the question, was not a curse rather than a blessing to the nation, were it not accompanied by well-thought-out principles and by sound judgment." That Mr. Gladstone had been the means of conferring vast benefits upon the country was undeniable, but as a tactical leader of the Liberal party his success, in Lord Hartington's eyes, had been less conspicuous. Three times—in 1866, in 1874, and in 1886—he had led his party to disaster or defeat, and the last defeat had not only rent the party in twain, but had shattered it beyond all human probability or possibility of reconstruction. After vindicating the memory of Pitt from Mr. Gladstone's violent language, Lord Hartington went on to condemn the latter for coquetting with the question of Home Rule for Scotland, for which there was no serious demand at all; and he could only account for such conduct by supposing that Mr. Gladstone now realised that his Home Rule for Ireland was a more difficult task than he had anticipated. Lord Hartington, moreover, charged Mr. Gladstone with an attempt, by his articles in the *Nineteenth Century* and elsewhere, "to inflame animosities which were dying out." He founded a still graver charge upon Mr. Gladstone's endorsement of the assertion (made by Mr. W. O'Brien) that Ireland had "no moral, but only a prudential, obligation to obey the law." The approval of such a sentiment by an ex-Prime Minister seemed to Lord Hartington "not very far from direct incitement to some ardent minds to what everybody admits would be the greatest calamity that could befall our country—the outbreak of actual insurrection—and that he is approaching very closely to the limits, if he is not overstepping the limits, which ought to guide the conduct of a loyal subject of the Queen." Referring to Mr. Gladstone's suggestion of a modification of the constitution in the direction of the model of the United States and of the Swiss Confederation, Lord Hartington asked his Scotch audience whether they had so little to do with England, in their business and social relations, that they attached "no value to the power which you at present possess of influencing and modifying English legislation and English government." He concluded by commenting on the obstructive spirit which animated the Opposition, and proved their determination to ensure, so far as they were able, that no Irish reform should be carried into execution "unless it were built upon the ruins of the British constitution and the authority of the law."

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking on the same day at Newcastle, reiterated his demand that the Gladstonian policy should be submitted to reason and argument. He glanced at the statement of Mr. Asquith, Q.C., one of Mr. Gladstone's staunchest supporters, that "only that Government was satisfactory and safe which enjoyed the consent and approval of the governed," and he inquired whether Mr. Asquith and his friends would be pre-

pared to give to the Irish people independence, if they asked for it. If they would not, what became of the principle? If they would, they were perfectly ready to see the Empire broken up. Mr. Chamberlain next turned to Sir George Trevelyan, whom he described as "a political weathercock," who, when the Home Rule Bill was first introduced, had declared that, "if he stood alone, he would go into the lobby against so mischievous a measure," for there was "no half-way house between Imperial control and separation." Mr. Chamberlain next reiterated his oft-repeated questions to the Gladstonians: "How do you propose to deal with the wishes of the majority in Ulster?" "How do you propose to secure the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament?" Turning away at length from the Gladstonian policy and its chief supporters, whom he taunted with inconsistency and misrepresentation, Mr. Chamberlain discussed the possibility of the formation of a new party on the basis suggested by Lord Hartington. Whilst warmly supporting the idea, he was of opinion, in view of the difficulties of party organization, there was no need to hurry on the question. A new party, he thought, must come by evolution, if at all, and it was the duty rather of the Conservatives—the most numerous branch of the Unionist party—to take the first steps. If they were satisfied with the existing state of things, and thought they would permanently hold the fort, the Liberal Unionists saw no reason to press for any change.

Sir William Harcourt, at Salisbury (Oct. 3), replied to both these speeches by a brilliant, although unsubstantial, display of platform oratory, towards the close of which he showed how much truth there was in the assertion made by an ultra-Radical supporter, Mr. Atherley Jones, M.P., in a recent article on the political situation. This writer, in very temperate language, declared that his own experience, and that of many of his colleagues, showed that the Irish question alone was not sufficient to bring back the Liberals to power at the next general election. He maintained that English electors, knowing that the tangible grievances of the Irish farmers and tenants had been removed and relieved to a degree unknown in England, they were by no means moved to redress sentimental grievances whilst so many social questions were pressing for solution in their midst. Although protests and replies had been made to Mr. Atherley Jones' article, they had come from Liberals who were not representing constituencies, and from men who had not the means of ascertaining the feelings and requirements of the electors. Sir William Harcourt, therefore, after ridiculing the attitude of the Unionist leaders as "an army of epaulettes"—plenty of officers with no rank-and-file—declared that one of them, Lord Hartington, was honestly against Home Rule; and the other, Mr. Chamberlain, was not—he was only against Mr. Gladstone; and that this discordance would bring about the extinction of the party. After glancing at the proposal to establish a new national party.

which he described as "a very old idea of broken-down politicians," Sir William Harcourt turned to the Dock Labourers' Strike, and drew from it the moral that it had improved materially the condition of a greater number of men who had deserved some improvement; and finally, he took up the cry which Mr. S. Plimsoll had raised in previous years against the criminal carelessness of which our merchant-sailors were the victims. He insisted that Parliament should at once put a stop to the practice of over-insurance, and should call to heavy account those who profited by this scandalous perversion of the law.

To this speech Lord Hartington replied at Stirling (Oct. 4), defending the Unionist alliance, as not only justifiable, but "enforced by the highest political necessities." In answer to Sir William Harcourt's charge that the Unionists threatened obstruction, he remarked that his political aim through life had not been merely to put himself on the side of the majority, but to consider what his course should be, not only if his policy should triumph, but also if it should meet with temporary defeat. The worst that could happen to the Unionists at the next general election would be the return of a majority in favour of giving some undefined sort of Home Rule to Ireland. But that would by no means settle the question, for the desire would have to be translated into some action, and a new Home Rule scheme would have to be presented to Parliament. The duty of the Unionists then would be to apply the most searching criticism to the provisions of such a scheme, and most probably to offer the strongest and most prolonged opposition to many of them; and such a proceeding would not be of so factious and obstructive a character as Sir William Harcourt seemed to suppose. The Unionists objected to Home Rule because it was unnecessary, because it would be actually mischievous, because it was opposed to the wishes and strongest convictions of a large and important minority, because they had no confidence in the persons who assumed to represent the voice and opinions of Ireland—men who had been closely allied with the enemies of Great Britain—and because it would probably be the means of doing great and unmerited injustice to the great Protestant minority in Ireland. Having dealt with the question of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, Lord Hartington went on to say that, as to the view that the granting of Home Rule would only be the beginning of a great scheme of federation, he did not see at present any probability of the practical adoption of such a scheme. He did not see, on our part, any desire to abandon to the colonies the control over questions of peace or war, or of the maintenance of Imperial defensive establishments; he did not see, on the part of the colonies, any strong desire to undertake any part of the burden of Imperial establishments and Imperial defence. But the federation of the Empire had nothing to do with the disintegration of the United Kingdom, and if the scheme

for Ireland was to be defended, it must be defended on its own merits.

If, however, the speeches of Unionist leaders failed to provoke an argumentative defence of the altered conditions upon which the new Home Rule Bill would be framed, Professor Freeman, a staunch supporter of Mr. Gladstone's original measure, succeeded in obtaining an authoritative assurance that the retention of the Irish members at Westminster would, in deference "to the public sense," be acceded to. Professor Freeman declared himself in favour of the original Bill, for the sake of England as much as for the sake of Ireland. To have, said Professor Freeman, a separate Parliament in Ireland, and also have Irish members in the Parliament of Great Britain, could have no meaning except it meant something like England being a dependency of Ireland, and he did not want to go quite so far as that. If the Parliament of England were to become a subordinate body, Englishmen would not submit to it. They could not make a federation of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, for England was so much greater than the others that they would have to submit to her.

In Mr. Labouchere's speech at Bexhill (Oct. 3) there was a faint echo of Professor Freeman's regret that the old Bill was not to be re-introduced. But more important were the remarks of this now prominent leader of the extreme Radicals with reference to other questions. He declared his intention of opposing any Land-Purchase Scheme, first, because British money would go to the landlords, and secondly, because he was afraid of the argument that, if the State owned the soil of Ireland, it could not afford to grant Home Rule. He would, however, accept the Local Government Scheme, because the local authorities could be trusted to fight for Home Rule—and he was in favour of accepting arms from the enemy, and then shooting him down.

More interest, however, attached to the appearance of Lord R. Churchill in Scotland, and many rumours were afloat as to the attitude that this headstrong party-leader might take up towards friends and foes; and the fears of the former were almost as loudly expressed as the hopes of the latter. To the surprise of both, at Perth he not only spoke forcibly, but circumspectly, reserving all his sarcasm for the leaders of the Opposition, and for Sir William Harcourt in particular. He cordially recognised the efforts of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to keep down expenditure, and congratulated the Tories upon having the Liberal Unionist party for a lightning-conductor to ward off Radical rage. But if the Liberal Unionists were open to attack, Sir William Harcourt ought not to have been the man to attack them, as he was the man who, all through the Parliament which was elected in 1880, held up the Irish to execration, charged their leaders with direct complicity in crime, and was loudest and most violent in denouncing any alliance between the English

political parties and the Irish Nationalist party. The Allotments Act, instead of proving a sham, had already supplied land to eight thousand agricultural labourers who never had any before, and this result had been attained in the first few months of the working of an Act which was perfectly novel in its nature, and which had to be tried as an experiment. The result of the Act, therefore, was not only sensible, but in every way highly satisfactory. Before concluding, Lord R. Churchill gave some practical advice to Scotch Conservatives, warning them of the dangers they ran in allowing themselves to be manipulated by party managers. In the evening of the same day (Oct. 5) Lord R. Churchill addressed a large meeting. Defending the Unionist cause, he declared that we had by the Parliamentary Union blended together and indissolubly joined "the flashing genius and the warm imagination of the Irishman, the solid judgment and the prudent calculation of the Scotchman, and the intuitive common sense and the great capacity for endurance of the Englishman." By this "legislative chemistry" had been produced the most powerful human agency for civilisation and progress which the world had ever known, and the result had thoroughly justified the idea of Parliamentary Union, as he showed by the case of Scotland. At the time the Union took place the poverty of Scotland was great, there were constant struggles between the Highlands and the Lowlands, the Protestant religion was beset by an acute danger, Scotland had little or no trade with Europe, Scotland's manufacturers and Scotland's products were entirely excluded from every British colony, there was little or no commercial intercourse between Scotland and England, and there was an intense ill-will and jealousy between the people of Scotland and the people of England. But since the Union Scotland had become vastly wealthy, and was united from end to end; all race-hatred and tribal struggles had been entirely forgotten, the commercial intercourse between Scotland and England was of immeasurable volume and value, and the warmest and most permanent feelings of mutual regard and respect, and even of affection, existed between the Scottish and the English people. This Lord Randolph attributed to the Union, and he pointed out that the way in which the Scotch Union was brought about was open to the same objection as was the way in which the Irish Union was brought about. A considerable portion of the Scottish Parliament was bribed, and acted under corrupt influences, and it did not represent, but, on the contrary, entirely misrepresented, the wishes and feelings of the Scottish people. The Scottish opposition to the Scottish Union lasted for more than fifty years after the Union was effected, and then gradually died out. In Ireland, already more than one-third of the people were enlisted warmly in support of the Irish Union, and perhaps the most wealthy, powerful, and determined were ready, if necessary, to rise in arms in its defence. The progress of Ireland since the

Union had been far more rapid, relatively, than the progress of Scotland, and the peasantry were far more comfortably off. But when the Union took place the Irish, as a people, were almost penniless, the Irish Government and nation were on the brink of insolvency, the peasantry were half-clothed, half-starved, and totally uneducated. That was the result of eighteen years of government by an independent Irish Parliament. He therefore maintained that the Parliamentary Union of England, Scotland, and Ireland had been splendidly and magnificently justified in its results. In conclusion, he insisted that the maintenance of the Parliamentary and Executive Union, unbroken or unimpaired, was essential to the safety of the State. Ireland and Irish interests need not, or should not, be neglected because a Parliament in which all three kingdoms were represented worked for a common object.

In the short truce of words which ensued upon the Northern campaign, an attempt was made to rouse public interest in foreign politics. The *Daily News* called attention to the cruelties practised by the Turkish Kurds in Armenia, and to the persistent disregard shown by the Porte of the engagements taken by it under the Treaty of Berlin. The assertions made by the representatives of the Armenian Christians, as well as the reports of English correspondents, were stoutly denied by the Turkish authorities. Nevertheless, sufficient pressure was brought to bear upon the Sultan's Government to subject the chief inculpated, Moussa Bey, to a form of trial, which, as was anticipated, led to his acquittal on most of the charges laid against him. The state of affairs in the Island of Crete was next brought forward by the same journal, and the public sympathy was appealed to on behalf of the Christian population, which was suffering from the misgovernment and tyranny of the Turkish authorities, as well as from the immunities enjoyed by the Turkish population when charged with offences against their fellow-Christian subjects. At length matters assumed such an alarming aspect in certain districts that Turkish troops were despatched to restore order, and in so doing, it was alleged by the Greek sympathisers with the Christians, treated the inhabitants with great severity, although they never went so far as to justify European interference. The Austrian consul at Canea, however, put a somewhat different complexion on the matter, declaring the revolution brought about by foreign agitators had been taken advantage of by both Mussulmans and Christians to settle outstanding quarrels, and that its suppression by Chakir Pasha had been effected by an administration which, if severe, was thoroughly impartial. This view found favour with public opinion in this country, and the Greek Government having discovered that its slightly-veiled views upon Crete would receive no support, the matter was allowed to rest.

An article in the *Contemporary Review* (Oct.) signed by "Owtidos," which persons professing to be well-informed

declared to be a pseudonym adopted by Mr. Gladstone, attracted much attention. It was, in a measure, addressed to the Italians, urging them to abandon their ruinous policy of maintaining armaments in excess of their power and their needs, to come to a friendly understanding with the Pope and with France, and inferentially suggesting the unwisdom of their statesmen in throwing in the lot of Italy with that of Germany and Austro-Hungary. The writer, moreover, urged the ingratitude of a policy which was exasperating the country—France—to which Italians owed their autonomy. He argued that France and Germany, Austria and Russia, forming necessarily antagonistic centres, it was intelligible that Germany and Austria should enter into alliance against the other two powers. He was, however, unable to understand why Italy should be anxious to enter an alliance which was somewhat unintelligibly described as a League of Peace. The collective strength of Germany, Austria, and Italy was about equal, the writer maintained, to that of France and Russia, so that there was an absence of that predominance of strength on one side which was requisite to impose strength on the other. If England joined the Triple Alliance, its predominance might be ensured; but the vast majority of Englishmen were averse to our taking any part in Continental politics, unless bound to do so by treaty or moral obligation. The studied reticence of Sir Jas. Fergusson's replies to Mr. Labouchere in the House of Commons just before the close of the Session, in some measure furnished a text for the warnings and misgivings expressed by "Outidanos," but no serious apprehension was felt by any section of the public that Lord Salisbury would take any step which, whilst guaranteeing by this country the support of the Triple Alliance, might at any moment embroil us with France or Russia on questions with which the central European powers might declare their total unconcern.

To the views expressed in this article (without, however, alluding to it directly) Signor Crispi replied, in a speech at Palermo (Oct. 14), which was at once telegraphed *in extenso* to Berlin, Paris, and London. Italy, he said, had been "a satellite of the Napoleonic Empire," but the object of her Government since the fall of that Empire had been to assume for her an independent position as a great power. This had been successfully achieved, and Italy now made treaties with first-class powers on terms of equality. The danger of war, Signor Crispi admitted, recently existed, but it had passed away, and Italy had used its position to preserve peace. With regard to the internal situation, Italy, he declared, amid loud shouts of approval, would keep Rome, leaving the Pope free in the government of the Church and the use of spiritual weapons. "Let the Church endeavour to frighten Prometheus with the thunderbolts of Heaven. Our task is to fight in the cause of reason." In conclusion, he appealed to the Radicals to separate themselves from the

Socialists and Anarchists, and expressed the hope that he might convince the latter whilst still speculating; but he should have to repress them when they proceeded to action. He, however, promised to introduce a poor law which, he declared, "would be a boon even to a people without liberty."

But if European political questions, even when stirred by the master-hand, failed to arouse interest in England, it was not so with the partition of the great African continent, which seemed to be going on apace. The recommendation of the Privy Council (Oct. 15), that a charter should be granted to the British South Africa Company, was justly regarded as a proof that the expansion of England was not wholly a memory or a dream. Its aim was to develop and administer that portion of South Africa bounded on the north by the central and lower Zambesi River, and on the south by the Transvaal; and its directors, among whom were Mr. Rhodes (the practical pioneer of British enterprise in the Transvaal), the Dukes of Fife and Abercorn, and other well-known personages, were to enjoy sovereign rights over the territories ceded to them, subject to the general and nominal control of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The area marked out included British Bechuanaland, Khama's Country, and Matabeleland, and comprised about 400,000 square miles, of which a very large portion was a table-land about 5,000 feet above sea level, adapted for every kind of agriculture. The less fertile parts were described as rich in all kinds of minerals, especially in gold. The chief danger to the success of the Company lay in the undefined claims, real or imaginary, of the Portuguese, which had lain dormant for many years, but which at any moment might be revived if immediate profit, political or material, might be expected from them. It was, however, argued that the three other great trading companies, whose charters were more or less modelled on that of the old East India Company—the North Borneo Company, the Royal Niger Company, and the East Africa Company—had so far been able to arrange with their neighbours, native and European, as to avoid arousing national susceptibilities. In South Africa, the long-standing jealousy of the Portuguese and Transvaal Boers might, it was hoped, be turned to account by the new-comers, although in the first instance the dangers arising from the claims of Portugal, which, in theory, stretched inland for an indefinite distance, might possibly give rise to trouble. The interest taken in England in this enterprise, as well as in the speedy "development" of South Africa, showed itself in the ready support given to all sorts of exploration and industrial undertakings—for which the public eagerly subscribed large sums of money—and in the rapidly-increasing flow of emigration to the new fields of labour thus laid open.

The short truce in the Parliamentary campaign having come to an end, skirmishing was commenced with equal vigour by both parties. In Yorkshire, the Earl of Carnarvon (Oct. 9) and

the Solicitor-General (Oct. 10) defended the policy of the Government, especially in the matters of Light Railways and Higher Education, which was attacked by Mr. Shaw Lefevre (Oct. 9), the Marquess of Ripon, and Mr. Herbert Gladstone (Oct. 12). At Durham (Oct. 14), Lord Herschell, usually the most circumspect of the Gladstonian leaders, declared that England would not suffer for twenty-four hours the administration of the law which obtained in Ireland. He was especially severe upon the resident magistrates, as a class unfit to be entrusted with the administration of such law. At Bury, on the following day (Oct. 15), Lord Spencer spoke with somewhat greater energy, drawing a very marked line of distinction between coercion as applied by the Liberals and Unionists to Ireland. The legislation of the former had been only temporary, but the latter had made their Bill permanent. "While exceptional legislation," said Lord Spencer, "might be advantageously applied as regarded the stamping out of crime, I doubt whether it could be successfully applied to institutions which had the support of the people of the country." Frankly recognising the mistaken policy which he had himself maintained when Viceroy, Lord Spencer continued: "The serious evil in Ireland is the dislike, the hatred of the population to the Government which was set up. . . . The whole system of English government must be altered; the system of governing Ireland from London must be removed root-and-branch." His optimism led him to anticipate no similar difficulties in the government of Belfast and Ulster from Dublin, and he reiterated his firm conviction that Home Rule was the only cure for the ills from which Ireland had so long suffered.

In the South of England, the Unionist campaign was being carried on by Mr. Courtney and Mr. Chamberlain. The former, representing one of the divisions of Cornwall, and recognising the strength of the Dissenters in that county, addressed himself, in his first speech, at Saltash (Oct. 10), more especially to the tithes question, insisting that it was neither the farmer nor the landlord who paid tithes: it was simply a reservation dating from a time long before the present landlords held possession of a part of the property in land for national purposes and uses. It was not taken from the landlord, because he never had it; nor from the farmer, because he did not pay it; but it was a reserved interest in the land of the country, just as if a certain portion of the land itself had been reserved. No legislation ought to be allowed to fritter away or to diminish, for the benefit of persons who had no right to be benefited, this national inheritance, which ought to be most zealously and carefully preserved. It was national property, to be applied for none but national uses. He denounced land nationalisation as "a wicked and foolish dream," which would do harm, instead of good, even if it could be carried out; but the tithe was a species of land nationalisation which did no harm to anybody, and which should be preserved; and he

approved of the attempt of the Government to simplify it by providing that a definite, ascertained tithe-rent should be paid to the tithe-owner, the farmer having nothing whatever to say to it. The resistance to the payment of tithe he held to be absolutely indefensible. As to the question of disestablishment, while he was not in favour of the disestablishment of the Welsh Church, he held that the question of the Welsh Church was not inextricably tied up with that of the English Church. The two did not necessarily stand or fall together. The question of the Welsh Church must be faced on its own merits, which could not be held to be inextricably connected with those of the English Church, to the disestablishment of which he did not then see his way. As to free education, he insisted on the responsibility of parents for the education of their children ; but his mind was open, and he was ready to consider, examine, and test any plan that might be laid before him, though he did not see any possibility of devising a plan which should secure gratuitous education, according to the religious belief of parents of so many different persuasions, without producing the most violent dissensions and the greatest heartburning throughout the nation.

On the following day, at St. Germans, Mr. Courtney reiterated his objections to the chimerical "social reforms," with which the democracy was befooled by professional agitators. He protested against the various schemes which tended to degenerate the manhood and independence of the people, and maintained that the function of the State was not to bestow charity on the working-man, but to remove difficulties which impeded industry and bettered trade, and to free the land, so as to make it more accessible to the enterprise and industry of the people.

A few days later, Mr. Courtney attended a large gathering of Liberal Unionists (Oct. 16) at Plymouth. On this occasion he was accompanied by Mr. Chamberlain, who by a curious coincidence took the place which was occupied two years previously by Sir George Trevelyan, his fellow-dissident from Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, but now one of its warmest supporters. On this occasion Mr. Courtney took up Mr. Gladstone's banning of the Liberal Unionists, and maintained that they deserved the thanks of the Gladstonians themselves for having compelled the abandonment of "a rash, premature, ill-considered, and ill-concocted scheme." He insisted that the general improvement, even in the West, and notwithstanding the opposition of the Irish members, was patent to all. The law, against which no just complaint could be made, was now administered in a spirit of perfect justice, and with a desire to secure fair dealing. Indeed, for the last fifty years there had been a gradual process of legislation working for the good of the Irish people, and a gradual reconciliation of those people, and contentment had been spreading from the top gradually to the bottom ; so that the whole people were being drawn into bonds of unity and peace with our-

selves. If this were thought irreconcilable with the fact that there were eighty-five Nationalist members opposed to the Union, it must be remembered that they were elected when the constituencies were for the first time enfranchised, and when they were under the influence of a period of great distress, and led by leaders who had acquired their confidence during that period. Mr. Courtney went on to urge that land reform must be dealt with in Ireland, but not in any "hasty or universal" way. Imperial action was wanted in the congested districts of the West, and there he would say to the Government, "Be bold," even though a courageous attempt to deal with the question might prove costly and onerous; but with regard to the greater part of Ireland, where the temptation to extend Lord Ashbourne's Act was excessive, he would say, "Be cautious," for another serious fall in prices would make the situation anything but pleasant; and one of the grievous features of peasant-proprietary in Europe was the indebtedness of the nominal owner where the land was burdened by mortgage and the calls of the usurer. In his opinion, the real solution would rather be found in establishing proprietaries unfettered by the control of dominant lords, unchecked in the matter of cultivation, but possibly under permanent charge to the extent, perhaps, of two-thirds value to some local institution such as a land-bank, which should be on one side a depôt of the people's earnings, and, on the other, the real owner of a large part of the interest in the land. In any case, however, the final settlement of the land question as a whole should rather wait on the settlement of the question of local government; and to the argument that local government would be used by the Nationalists to advance their own projects, Mr. Courtney replied that Ulster asked for it, and if Ulster was not afraid, there was no need for alarm on our part.

Mr. Chamberlain's tone was altogether more aggressive, and had a double purpose—that of counteracting the influence Mr. Gladstone might have exercised during his visit at Whitsuntide, and of replying to Sir William Harcourt's version of the Round-Table Conference. After treating the results of the recent bye-elections as a matter of small importance to the Unionists, but likely to prove of serious danger to the Gladstonians, in view of the impossible promises with which they had beguiled the electors, Mr. Chamberlain gave a short survey, from his own point of view, of the Home Rule controversy since it first came to the front, in 1885. He emphatically denied Sir William Harcourt's assertion, that when he joined Mr. Gladstone's Administration at the beginning of 1886 he was "pledged to a policy of Home Rule which would revolutionise the government of Ireland," and that he had no opposition to Home Rule, but was "animated entirely by personal ill-will to Mr. Gladstone." This Mr. Chamberlain declared was "a perverse and wilful misrepresentation, absolutely and wholly the invention of Sir William Har-

court, who was too apt to impute to opponents motives by which his own conduct had been governed." Mr. Chamberlain, however, admitted that in joining the Government he knew that Mr. Gladstone was pledged to a policy of Home Rule; but Mr. Gladstone himself told him at the time that he "had no plan, and no definite scheme," and that "all that he wanted was a full and careful inquiry into the Irish demand." The policy which Mr. Gladstone ultimately brought forward was "a monstrous policy," and so impracticable that it could not possibly have been carried to a successful issue. There was hardly a single man in the House of Commons at the time who was prepared to say a good word in favour of it; but then began a period "of persuasion, of blandishment, entreaty, and threat, and even of bribery." Mr. Gladstone's soul was now filled with horror at the iniquities of "the blackguard Pitt," who employed corruption in securing the Union. But what was to be said of an Administration which employed corruption to destroy the Union? What was to be said of the men who "now owed their titles and their social distinction to the fact that they voted against their convictions upon the second reading of the Home Rule Bill"? After the Bill was defeated, its cardinal feature—the withdrawal of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament—was changed, and it was now declared by Mr. Gladstone himself, that the Irish members were to be retained at Westminster, though even yet Mr. Gladstone's own followers were not quite agreed upon the subject, and the difficulties which had arisen over it showed how unfortunate was the ambiguity in which that gentleman was able to clothe the English language. Other questions were left open, such as the treatment of Ulster, the control of the constabulary, and the appointment of the magistrates and judges.

Mr. Chamberlain then turned to his second subject, and proceeded to deal with the famous "Round-Table Conference," contradicting at the outset the statement made by Sir William Harcourt with regard to what took place there. The policy upon which the parties to that conference agreed was not Mr. Gladstone's policy, and, despite Sir William Harcourt's statement, there was no agreement among them upon a Parliament in Dublin with an Executive dependent upon it. Mr. Chamberlain read from a note which he made at the time of the conference this entry: "Not one word was said about a Parliament in Dublin and an Executive dependent upon it." The plans discussed were very different ones, such as a proposal to establish some system of provincial authorities after the fashion of the provincial constitution of Canada, wholly subordinate and under control, having certain subjects specially referred to them, the Imperial Parliament having concurrent jurisdiction and a concurrent right of making laws and levying taxes, and a separate treatment being, of course, provided for Ulster. He believed the negotiations, which promised so well at that conference, were

broken off because there was a power behind the Liberal leaders which they did not dare to face. Finally Mr. Chamberlain declared that he had never disputed the claim of the Irish people to a larger share in the management of their own affairs, but he agreed with Sir George Trevelyan that "between the Imperial Parliament and separation there was no halfway house." At the same time, he believed that even now, after all the discussions which had taken place, and the bitter recriminations, if they could only get a full, free, and frank discussion they might come to an agreement; for the Unionist party in all its sections had always been ready to accept as a basis of discussion the propositions which Mr. Gladstone laid down in 1885—that Ireland should have the largest possible extension of local government, consistent with the supremacy of Parliament, the integrity of the empire, and the protection of minorities. Meanwhile he repeated the old demand to know what the new Home Rule policy really was.

On the following day, speaking at Bodmin, he took a somewhat wider view of the future, and declared that if Home Rule were granted there would be greater trouble and disaffection than ever, and it would lead to civil war. Indeed, it would lead to even worse than that—to separation and to the dismemberment of the British empire. As to coercion, he asked what was the difference between the coercion practised by Mr. Gladstone himself and that practised by the present Government, except that the former was much the more severe? After all, coercion was only a nickname. It sounded badly, but it only meant the maintenance of the ordinary law, and did not touch honest men. The experience of history was against Mr. Gladstone's assurance that the fears of the Irish Protestants were entirely without foundation. Though it was not believed that the Roman Catholics of to-day would act as their ancestors did two hundred years ago, what was feared was that a Roman Catholic Parliament would not rest until it had secured a dominant religious supremacy which would be injurious to the religious and material interests of the minority, just as the granting of a separate provincial Government to Quebec had resulted in establishing a Roman Catholic predominance in the government of Quebec, whereby the supremacy of the Church of Rome had been secured; that Church had been State endowed, and taxation had been levied so unequal in its incidence that no Protestant had a chance in competition, and great numbers of the Protestant population had left the province.

Although Mr. Chamberlain's second speech touched upon much more dangerous ground, and invited controversy, it was allowed to pass almost without challenge under cover of the outcry aroused by his earlier speech. Its intention was admitted to have been conciliatory and to make a bid for the support of the more moderate Gladstonians; but the charge of "corrupt in-

fluences" having been brought to bear upon halting Liberals drew forth indignant protests and denials from many who had not been exposed to such temptations. It was, however, generally conceded that Mr. Chamberlain had put an unnecessary, harsh interpretation on the honours conferred at Mr. Gladstone's request on the break up of his administration. In recommending the names of certain staunch followers for substantial rewards the Prime Minister had only followed the precedent of all outgoing Cabinets.

The Conservatives found in their Home Secretary an able spokesman, who in his address to his constituents at Birmingham (Oct. 16) made a general survey of the work which ministers had, in spite of much opposition, been able to carry through. He cordially accepted the alliance of the Liberal Unionists, and recognised not only their support, but their self-denial on many occasions. He attributed the "obstructive tactics, undisciplined violence and discordant cries" of the Opposition "to the fact that party leadership, in the old and responsible sense, no longer existed; for Mr. Gladstone's lieutenants, like Alexander's generals, were each fighting for his own success."

A somewhat similar idea, worked up with greater oratorical effect, was put forward by the Chief Secretary, Mr. Balfour, in addressing a mass meeting of his constituents at Manchester (Oct. 19). "The Liberal Party," he said, "remind me of one of those motley hordes of conquering barbarians, drawn from many tribes, professing many religions, having in view many objects, but principally plunder, who join together under the standard of one noted leader in the hope that when he has led them to victory, they will be able to turn the victory not to his account, but their own." The three things which Ireland most required, he declared, were protection of the minority, vindication of the law, and development of material resources. These the Government had endeavoured to give, and the Radicals, as shown in Mr. Storey's opposition to the Light Railways Bill, did their utmost to withhold. For the rest, his speech was devoted to a defence of his Irish policy, and in contradicting for the hundredth time the specific charges of influencing the course of justice, of cruelty and tyranny which were repeated by his opponents. With regard to the success of the Government policy in Ireland, Mr. Balfour said: "Every expectation which in my most sanguine moments I ever ventured to frame with regard to the results, the happy results, that might follow from a firm administration of the law in Ireland, and from the course of remedial legislation which we have begun, though we have not finished,—every such expectation, I say, has been fulfilled, and more than fulfilled."

He next went through a number of charges which had been made against him by the Opposition leaders, reiterating the denials he had already given. To judge, however, from the repe-

tition of the same charges almost immediately after Mr. Balfour's speech, it would seem either that the Opposition speakers never read the denials, or that the courtesy which hitherto characterised political discussion had altogether disappeared.

On their side the principal speakers were Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Henry Fowler. The former, addressing a Welsh gathering at Carnarvon (Oct. 17), humorously described the "great national party," of which the formation had been unavoidably postponed. After bluntly contradicting Mr. Chamberlain's version of what had occurred at the Round-Table Conference, he discussed the bye-elections and the evidence afforded by them of an approaching change of political opinion throughout England; Ireland, Scotland, and Wales had already given their adherence to the new Liberalism, and "the conversion of England" was about to commence. His second speech was more directly a reply to Lord R. Churchill's recent attempt "to persuade the Welsh people of the virtues of Toryism and the blessings of Church Establishment." Sir Wm. Harcourt maintained that the Welsh people were essentially averse to the Established Church, and he asked by what right did the English Tories impose on the people of Scotland or Wales an ecclesiastical institution which neither nation desired? Such conduct would make a demand for Home Rule almost irresistible. The Church in Wales had had every opportunity and advantage, and for generations had possessed all the endowments of the Welsh, and the control of education; but she had not commanded the confidence of the Welsh people. Everybody knew that it was not the Anglican Church which had made, or which now made, the principal spiritual provision for the people of Wales, and Lord Aberdare had pointed out that religion would have disappeared from the principality if it had not been for the exertions of the Nonconformists. What a sentence was that on the conduct and traditions of a National Church! In Wales, as in Ireland, there was a broad line of separation between the landowner and the clergyman on one side and the people on the other, resulting in a divorce in sympathy and in sentiment, social, political, and religious. The Anglican clergy in Wales were not the leaders of the people, but were vehement and bitter partisans everywhere against the popular cause, the consequence being that the voice of Wales was more unanimous than ever against the Church Establishment. The time had therefore come when the Church in Wales must cease to exist, and this was the work which the Liberal party must set before itself. He next dealt with the tithe question, and in reference to the Government Bill of last session, he contended that of all the methods of dealing with the tithe question that of county-courting the tenant-farmers was the very worst that anybody could possibly have invented. Fortunately, the Opposition proved to be strong enough, though at the end of the session, to save the farmers

from their friends. As a matter of fact, the Tithe Bill was a Bill of pains and penalties against Wales, and it would have to be settled in accordance with the rights and demands of the Welsh people. In Wales the main question connected with the tithe was the object to which the tithe was to be devoted. What was the national use to which the Welsh tithe ought to be applied? It could not continue to be employed in the interests of a sect which represented a small minority of the Welsh people, and in an aggressive and deplorably hostile spirit against the other denominations in Wales, but it might be applied for free education, which had already been conceded to Scotland, and which Wales wanted quite as much as Scotland did. Sir Wm. Harcourt confessed that he himself was for free education. The tithe ought to be placed at the disposal of the people for the purposes of the education of the people without distinction of creed. It was said that if the money were thus appropriated the poor clergy would starve, but there was "something mean, contemptible, and ridiculous" in language of that sort. A Church which could not support its own ministers had no justification for its existence.

Sir Wm. Harcourt then turned to other questions in which the Welsh Liberals were specially interested—rentals, shorter leases, and Sunday-closing—promising to all the support of his party in Parliament. In the short space devoted to the Irish question Sir Wm. Harcourt declared that the nature of the Home Rule now proposed by the Gladstonians was that, subject to the authority of the Imperial Parliament, Ireland should have a legislature to deal with its exclusively domestic affairs. The authority of Parliament was to remain as it was, unimpaired and supreme, and all that was proposed was to delegate to an Irish legislature the conduct of its distinctly local and domestic business. As to the details of how it was to be done, that would be for the Home Rule majority to decide.

The Gladstonian successes at four bye-elections, to which reference has been already made, naturally encouraged the speakers on that side to think that "the flowing tide" which was to carry them to power had already set in their direction. Sir Wm. Harcourt, at the National Liberal Club dinner, given in honour of the new members (Oct. 23), saw in the result every prospect of reversing the ministerial majority. The chief interest of his jubilant speech, however, lay in its somewhat bitter personalities—suggesting that all hopes of a future reunion of the Liberal party were now abandoned by the Gladstonian leaders. In answer to the often-repeated appeal of the Unionists for some arguments in support of Home Rule, he declared that the polling booths alone would give the necessary reply. That this was to be the fixed policy of the Opposition was emphasized by Earl Spencer, who at Stockton (Oct. 24) declined to discuss the details of a Home Rule scheme on the ground that all that was

needed at the present stage was to agree upon the principle, and continually keep that before the constituencies. At Lancaster (Oct. 28), however, Lord Spencer went a step further, and, in discussing the mistakes of the Government, allowed his hearers to infer that his party, if in power, would have taken an opposite course. With regard to the development of the material resources of the country, he asked whether it was wise of the Government to undertake large public works or to lend large sums of money to companies to carry on such works. As a general rule it was far better to leave such matters to private enterprise; but the circumstances of Ireland were peculiar, and her poverty was so great that the enormous sum required for the drainage of the country could not be supplied by the Irish proprietors or by the Irish people, and the Government, which had frequently attempted drainage works in Ireland before, must go on doing something in the same direction. But he hoped the time would soon come when Ireland, having her own Government, would be able to do for herself all these necessary works, instead of coming to the English taxpayers to do it. But none of these works, whether relating to drainage or to railways, would remove the difficulties in Ireland, or have any political effect. As to the land question, the only remedy for Irish grievances was to make the occupier the owner of his land. There could be no permanent peace in Ireland until the land question was settled. He objected, however, to any further extension of the Ashbourne Purchase Act until some local authority was called into existence to stand as a buffer between the English taxpayer and the Irish tenant. As to the proposal to create local government in Ireland on the lines of the English county councils, Lord Spencer was satisfied that it would fail, as it would not meet the just aspirations of the Irish people for self-government, but would increase the number of representative bodies in Ireland which were bent on opposing the Government.

Sir George Trevelyan, at Fraserburgh (Oct. 23), likewise spoke, but said nothing to give any clue as to the scope of the Home Rule policy adopted by the leaders of the party. He said nothing of the new plan by which his party proposed to give Ireland a Parliament of her own, yet leave the Imperial Parliament absolute; to keep the Irish members at Westminster whilst refusing them the power of taxing Englishmen; to make Ireland a nation, yet binding her never to raise troops or levy customs duties. He said nothing of the methods by which Ulster was to be reconciled, and an Irish Executive, responsible only to its own Parliament, was to be compelled to respect Imperial treaties. This reticence was the more insisted upon by the Unionists, inasmuch as the speaker had come direct from Hawarden, where a council specially summoned had taken place apparently in consequence of the loud and oft-repeated appeals of

Unionists of all shades, and of certain Gladstonians, to know what would be the general features of the next Irish Home Rule scheme.

It was therefore heard with more than usual interest that without previous warning Mr. Gladstone was suddenly announced to speak at Southport (Oct. 23), and it was hoped that the result of the recent consultations with his principal lieutenants would be made known. All such anticipations, however, were promptly disappointed. He began his speech by a review of the state of affairs on the Continent. While admitting that according to appearances there was for the moment no cause to entertain apprehension, he yet acknowledged himself suspicious as to what might happen through the action of the Government of Turkey. Both in Crete and in Armenia misgovernment, oppression, and cruelties were reported—some of them barbarities worthy of Bulgaria in 1876—and though the Turkish Government denied the truth of these reports, he remembered that they put forward similar denials, which proved to be mendacious, in 1876. The standing misgovernment of Turkey must be a continual menace to the peace of Europe, an unwarranted provocation of its civilised and Christian sentiment, and a source of formidable danger to the whole of that quarter of the world. Mr. Gladstone next dealt with the state of public business in this country, and taunted the Government with the fact that though, at the beginning of last session, they promised in the Queen's Speech fourteen important measures, they had only passed six of them, and "eight had gone to the bottom of the sea." Of the six that were passed one related to the restoration of the coinage, and had been instrumental in circulating, as new coins, "the ugliest emblems ever placed in the hands of the British people." Another of the six measures created a Minister of Agriculture, but such a minister was in existence before, under the title of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Three other measures were undoubtedly good ones—one giving local government to Scotland, another reforming the Scottish Universities, and a third completing the scheme for the conversion of the National Debt. But Mr. Gladstone maintained that though the present Government had been in office for nearly three years and a half, they had never passed a single good measure except with the hearty concurrence and support of the Liberal Opposition, and he remembered no Government which had received anything like the amount of assistance from the Opposition that had been freely accorded to the present Government. Another of the measures taken up by the Government, or passed by their assistance—that providing for intermediate education in Wales—was not really a Government measure at all, but was introduced by Mr. Stuart Rendel, and supported by the Liberal party. Another measure passed, that relating to allotments, was of very little use, because the powers given under it for the compulsory acquisition of land for allot-

ments were placed in inefficient hands, and, instead of being given to the county councils, were given to the boards of guardians. The fact was that the good measures of the Government were only half measures, and even the best measure—that establishing county councils—was unsatisfactory, in so far as the county councils had been crippled in their powers.

Mr. Gladstone proceeded to disclaim all intention of now publishing to the world a “scheme of the Liberal policy of the future.” But it was pretty well understood what that policy would be, and he pointed out that it would at all events include proposals to amend and reform the registration of the country, to deal with the land laws, to deal with the licensing question, and to decide the subject of disestablishment in Scotland and in Wales on such lines as the sense of the people of those countries might determine. But the one great subject which overshadowed every other was the condition of Ireland. On this topic Mr. Gladstone once more enlarged at considerable length, pointing out that the laws applied to Ireland were not on a footing of equality with those applied to England; that peaceful combinations among the Irish people were prohibited; that peaceable and orderly meetings could be prohibited by the Lord-Lieutenant or dispersed by the police; that offenders were judged by removable magistrates, who, if in the opinion of the Government they “did not come up to the right mark,” could be at once dismissed without any reason assigned; and that “exclusive dealing,” a right enjoyed by every Englishman, was not the right of any Irishman. Mr. Gladstone proceeded to argue that if the same principles that governed the recent dock labourers’ strike in London had been employed by the tenants and shopkeepers of Ireland against an oppressive landlord they would have been penal. In reply to Mr. Balfour’s assertions, Mr. Gladstone laughed at the notion that the present Government had succeeded in “pacifying” Ireland. They had indeed succeeded by their coercion in producing a state of feeling in England such as had never before prevailed, for they had made the administration of the law odious; and he enforced this view by describing the unprecedented reception given to Mr. Morton, the new member for Peterborough, who, being a member of the London Common Council, was received, on attending a meeting of that body after his return to Parliament, by a large crowd, which cheered vociferously for the Plan of Campaign, which Mr. Gladstone admitted to be an illegal organisation. As to the diminution of crime in Ireland, he attributed much of it to the disestablishment of the Irish Church and the reform of the land laws, which had largely disarmed the excesses of cruelty and power. But agrarian crime was still about the same as it was in 1884 under Lord Spencer, for in that year there were only 762 such offences, and in 1888 they amounted to 770 in number. Mr. Gladstone complained that the Government, while claiming that evicted farms

were now being largely reoccupied, had furnished no returns on the subject by which the claim could be tested. But from the returns of the acreage of Ireland under crop it appeared, on comparing 1889 with 1888, that there was a decrease in that acreage of not less than 85,000 acres. So far, therefore, as any test could be applied, there was not the slightest sign that good had been done by the Crimes Act in that particular matter. Finally, Mr. Gladstone touched on the bye-elections, pointing out that the Opposition had gained twelve seats, while the Government had only gained one, and nine of the Opposition gains had been in England, so that the voice and mind of England in favour of yielding the constitutional, just, and reasonable demands of Ireland had now become undeniable.

Beyond giving publicly a cue to his followers, Mr. Gladstone's speech was regarded as one of his least effective displays. His story about the reception of Mr. Morton by the London Common Council was promptly contradicted, and proved to have been founded upon an inaccurate newspaper report. His assertion as to the rights enjoyed by Englishmen over Irishmen in the matter of "exclusive dealing" was disproved by the subsequent conviction of two men for "boycotting" at Salford (Dec. 20); and for the remainder of the year at least the clouds which had settled upon the political horizon in Eastern Europe grew lighter, the centre of danger shifting suddenly towards the African continent. There was, however, deducible from Mr. Gladstone's speech the obvious conviction that Home Rule could no longer be made the exclusive topic of the party utterances. Whether this change of feeling was due to an increasing though tacit approval of Home Rule in England, or to an increasing forgetfulness of its importance, it would be difficult to determine. In Ireland the substitution of material prosperity for quiescent discontent was too obvious to deprive the Ministry of all credit, however much the Nationalists might attempt to attribute the improvement to their own influence and leading; but the momentary dangers, threatened by the Gladstonian party, had passed away, and the English electors seemed only to want the excuse to range themselves again on their former party lines. In the bye-elections, which were taking place about this time, this desire to throw Home Rule into the background was especially noteworthy, and Peterborough and North Bucks were certainly recovered by the Liberals on questions which in no way related to Irish policy.

It was doubtless this conviction of indifference to the Separatist policy which forced the Unionists to keep themselves constantly in public notice. It was on the question of Irish Home Rule alone that they had ostensibly seceded from the Liberal party, and it was only on the plea that its danger was still imminent that they could justify their alliance with their traditional opponents. Lord Hartington, therefore, lost no time in replying to Mr. Gladstone's speech; and probably with

intent found his platform at Wolverhampton. The town continued to return as its representative Mr. C. P. Villiers, one of the first Free Traders and a consistent Radical for more than half a century. Before the meeting (Oct. 29) a letter from Mr. Villiers was read, in which he said that he had never viewed Mr. Gladstone's Bill with great favour, as lacking in durability and hardly satisfying the prevailing sentiment in Ireland as to its relations with this country. His own opinion respecting the maintenance of the Union had not been formed merely by the arguments recently adduced in its favour, but from the impressions he received upon entry, shortly after the Reform Act, into Parliament, which then contained a great number of independent and enlightened and earnest reformers who were determined not only that the mistakes of previous Parliaments should be corrected, but that in every respect where it was reasonable, justice should be done to Ireland :—

“Inspired by these feelings, the Union was a constant subject of discussion amongst themselves, when the reasons chiefly given for its maintenance were the great disunion that was said to pervade all classes and sections of society in Ireland and the conviction that the general interests of Ireland were more likely to be served and protected by the cordial co-operation of English and Irish Liberals in the united Parliament than by a native Parliament in which the feuds, differences, and dissensions were certain to be faithfully reproduced. . . . Past experience justifies the tendency now exhibited in most civilised parts of the world to develop local government and local institutions, subject to the supervision and control of a central authority.”

In the speech which followed the reading of this letter Lord Hartington declined to take the gloomy view of the Unionist position which might be derived from Sir William Harcourt's arithmetical forecast. Nevertheless Lord Hartington did not deny that the Unionists' reverses were such as to justify elation on the part of their opponents, especially of opponents to whom success at the polls was everything, and to whom the justice, the patriotism of their cause were matters of comparatively little significance. Still, for Liberal Unionists who had acted without considering whether they should find themselves among the majority or not, there was no cause for depression, much less for any change of conduct. At the next election their votes would be given in opposition to the return of what they regarded as a Separatist Government to power; and it would make no difference to them whether their efforts were to be crowned with ultimate success or not. But he could not admit that the end was even in sight; for he was convinced that neither Mr. Gladstone himself nor any of his colleagues could themselves see or know what was the end of that policy, or what they desired that end to be. He pointed out that “the absolute supremacy of Parliament” meant different things in different mouths, and that in giving up the exclusion

of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, Mr. Gladstone rendered necessary certain vital changes in the Constitution. If Irish members were to sit at Westminster and yet deal with English and Scottish affairs, England and Scotland must have a federal government. On the other hand, the presence of the Irish members in our Parliament and the part they took in our domestic affairs was frequently an inconvenience, and some might say a nuisance; but we tolerated that inconvenience because it was the only condition on which, in strict conformity with the principles of justice, the Imperial Parliament could assert its supreme right to control the management of Irish affairs, and to see that strict impartial justice was done to every class of our fellow-citizens in Ireland. In conclusion he declared that, as the masses were not stirred about Home Rule, the policy of many Gladstonians was to endeavour to ascertain what any class possessing votes in a locality wanted, and then to promise they would vote for those measures.

Almost simultaneously the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) was addressing a large audience at Hull and drawing very consolatory conclusions from the recent electoral contests, although they had ended disastrously for the Unionist cause, the supporters of which could not scatter broadcast the crop of promises which their opponents, even while sowing them, never hoped or desired to see bear fruit. Criticising the speech of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Goschen said his remarks about the peace of Europe were correct, only he omitted a great Power in which he ought to have taken some interest, and which had contributed somewhat to the general preservation of peace—the United Kingdom. We had regained to a great extent our position in Europe, and our voice was again listened to with respect. As to disturbances in Crete, Turkey had granted Home Rule to that island, with a majority of one religion and race and a minority of another, and the only tie was the payment of an annual tribute. That was a description precisely of the relations which were offered to Ireland. The extreme significance of Mr. Gladstone's materials for attack on the legislation of the Government might be gauged by the good-humoured but random hit he made at the Bill for the restoration of the coinage. In his enumeration of Bills, too, he had left out those for the increase of the navy and for the regulation of Royal grants. As to his contention that the support of the Opposition had been something quite extraordinary during the last session, if he had said it to Mr. Labouchere, the latter would have repudiated it with indignation. Taking broader ground, Mr. Goschen did not think the conduct of the Government could be fairly judged by the number of Bills alone they passed. It was as important to the nation and to the Empire that their commerce should be secure; that the influence of the country should be strong abroad; that there should be confidence at home, and that there should be secure conditions

under which they could carry on their untiring work of increasing the wealth and prosperity of the Empire. He further denied the propriety of the course taken by Mr. Gladstone and others in looking at the Government as if Ireland were practically the only task with which they had to deal. Let their colonial and foreign policy be thrown into the scale and then let the verdict be given.

"We do not fear the comparison between our foreign policy and that of our predecessors. We have been fortunate in some ways; we have had no small wars. We have had no surrender to defeat. We have had no costly and bloody expeditions which failed of their objects because they were undertaken too late. The damning cry of reproach, 'Too late! too late!' has not been shouted in the ears of the present Government. No, we have had no succession of humiliations in our diplomacy, and yet we have not shrunk from dealing with some of the most difficult problems. We believe that our colonies were never more cordially and more closely tied to us than they are at the present time."

They had been taken somewhat sharply to task in the case of Zanzibar, but they had increased their influence with the Arab races, and their action had produced from the Sultan a decree by which every slave imported after January 1 would be free, and every child born of a slave after January 1, 1890, would be free. Their trade was not a local but a world's trade. Many merchants and manufacturers were casting their eyes to the vast tracts through which the Zambesi flowed, thinking that there might be a vista of new enterprise. Through the diplomacy of the Government Persia has been opened up to British and other trade, and this object had been achieved, not by a drift policy, not by a fear that if they struck for their own interests they would offend the susceptibilities of foreign Powers. There might have been a fear of offending the susceptibilities of Russia, but now he believed that Russia was persuaded that conciliatory co-operation was the best policy to pursue in those distant regions, and that it was not by jealous competition that the best interests of the country could be served.

On the same evening (Oct. 29) Mr. John Morley, speaking at Bristol in the Colston Hall, had an opportunity of replying to the question which Lord Hartington and other Unionist leaders had been asking at other places besides Wolverhampton and Hull on various occasions during the recess. He, however, declined to avail himself of the opportunity, although he incidentally allowed the bias of his personal preferences to appear. He was not less satisfied with the political outlook than his opponents, expressing his strong conviction that he and his friends were approaching very rapidly the consummation of their political hopes. After criticising the mode of conducting the trials at Maryborough, he asked that Mr. Goschen, when he

came to Bristol, should answer straight out whether or not the late Lord-Lieutenant was right in saying it was hopeless to expect to govern Ireland without a Coercion Act. The mere extension of local government to Ireland would make matters worse. What Ireland wanted was a strong central Government, and it could only have that on condition that it was a national Government. It would, he thought, be necessary for the Government to deal with the land question next session, for he was informed that before the end of next year the whole of the present fund which the Government were able to expend in transactions of purchase and sale between landlord and tenant would have been applied for. Instead of answering the questions which had been addressed to him, he asked whether the Government were going to compel the landlords to sell. And if they were, how were they going to pay the landlords? After beginning to read from a paper parts of Mr. Chamberlain's old speeches by way of reply to the right hon. gentleman's present speeches, he tore up the paper amid some laughter, remarking that it was better not to read them, for they only served to mark a lamentable picture of the political Rake's Progress from ultra-Liberalism to ultra-Toryism. With regard to the apprehension expressed by Mr. Chamberlain as to persecutions by a Roman Catholic Legislature, Mr. Morley said the Archbishop of Dublin (Lord Plunket) was not of this opinion, for he had said last week that "the chief danger to be apprehended in Ireland was not the ascendancy of a hostile Church, but the prevalence of socialistic and anarchical doctrines." As to the Unionists' desire to know Mr. Gladstone's plan, Mr. Morley frankly avowed that the Home Rule leaders would and could not deliberate in public on their new scheme for retaining the Irish members at Westminster, whilst establishing an Irish Parliament and administration at Dublin. And he added, "It is absurd to pretend, as our opponents do, that because we desire to give to Ireland a local legislature and a local executive, responsible to it for the management of her own internal affairs, we are therefore bound by logical compulsion to throw the whole Constitution into the melting-pot, and instantly change the relations of Great Britain into federal relations." Mr. Morley went on to say that he did not like the Unionists' fondness for labels, such as Federal Home Rule, Colonial Home Rule, Canadian Home Rule, &c. It was not in this way, he said, that our forefathers made constitutional reform. Our forefathers did not say, "Let us constitute a limited Monarchy." What they said was, in very plain English, "Let us prevent the King from taking our money." They did not say, "Let us separate the executive from the legislative." What they said was, "Let us take care that no free man is cast into prison except by trial of his peers." The framers of the American Constitution did not come upon a platform and produce their scheme bit by bit, but fastened themselves up for five months.

They did not have any piecemeal criticism in the papers day by day.

In conclusion, Mr. Morley, who throughout had spoken with so much circumspection and self-restraint, seemed for a moment to allow his own personal views and feelings to transpire when he said, "The immersion, the absorption of the House of Commons in small Irish affairs—aye, and I will even say in big Irish affairs—is fatal to the power and efficiency of the House of Commons as the great supervising body of the Empire." It was not surprising that his critics fastened on this sentiment, and deduced therefrom a division in the counsels of the Home Rule party, and anticipated the opposition of Lord Spencer and Mr. Morley to the doctrine of Federalism which Mr. Gladstone had been understood to have formulated in his Whitsuntide campaign, and which had been adopted unhesitatingly by other members of the party.

Mr. Morley's excuse for the non-production of the new Home Rule scheme invited Mr. Goschen's obvious retort at Blackpool (Oct. 31) that the framers of the American constitution had not, previous to their five months' secret deliberation, produced a constitution which the country had rejected. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also took the opportunity of categorically denying the accuracy and applicability of the various tests proposed by Mr. Gladstone to show that the Government policy had not been as successful as its promoters pretended. Mr. Goschen might perhaps have spared himself the repetition of the denials which had already been put forward to meet the assertion of the leader of the Opposition; but the time had passed in political warfare when the word of a statesman was looked upon as more than the pleadings of a professional advocate bound to do the best for his clients. Of far greater interest, therefore, for the moment was the catechising to which Mr. John Morley was subjected by a section of his constituents (Nov. 4), and the insight which it gave into the sources whence working men derived their views of civil government. On the questions of the abolition of plural voting, of adult suffrage, shorter Parliaments, the payment of members, and the transfer to the rates of the costs of parliamentary elections, Mr. Morley found himself at one with the most advanced of his adherents. He was perhaps somewhat less unanimously supported when he declared himself in favour of the retention of the Monarchy, the mending rather than the ending of the House of Lords, free education up to a certain point, and a better inspection of factories and workshops. But he was distinctly at variance with his interviewers on certain other points, professing himself to be "dead against" the abolition of the Monarchy, an Eight Hours Bill, and the acquisition of the railways and "other means of transit" by the State; and he followed his leader, Mr. Gladstone, in denouncing the nationalisation of the land as either "folly or robbery." On this question

a correspondence sprang up in the papers from which it appeared that the working men who held to this view had fortified themselves with the opinion of Mr. Herbert Spencer. The spokesman of the Socialists at this meeting, Mr. Laidler, a bricklayer, explained what he and his friends understood by the nationalisation of the land. "By nationalisation we mean that a Commission should be appointed similar to the Commission appointed in Ireland upon the rent question, that the land should gradually fall into their hands, and that they should transfer it to the various municipalities or county councils, and that these bodies should deal with it according to the democratic spirit accordingly as they were elected for the purpose." Mr. Morley: "Are they to pay for it?" Mr. Laidler: "We think not." Mr. Morley: "You are going to take the land?" Mr. Laidler said their method of dealing with the land would be that the present owners should hold it for their time, and that it should revert back to the State. "They remembered that Mr. Herbert Spencer had said that the land had been taken by force or fraud, and that to right one wrong it takes another." In explanation Mr. Spencer wrote to the *Times* (Nov. 7) that the work ("Social Statics") in which he had propounded this view was forty years old, which he had refused to republish, and that it was applicable only as a principle of "absolute ethics." But by a curious coincidence on the day previous to that on which Mr. Herbert Spencer made this disclaimer, and a reservation on behalf of the requirements of "relative ethics," the London County Council voted (Nov. 5) by 69 to 39 to include in a Bill for widening the Strand by the removal of Holywell Street, provision "that owners of property within the Strand district or such part of it as might be defined in the Bill, not purchased by the Council, but likely to be improved by the operations of the scheme, should be required to contribute towards the expense of the improvement in proportion to the enhanced value of their property due to the improvement." Subsequent discussion of this Bill by the County Council showed that in the opinion of a considerable number "the contribution" should be equal to the whole extent of the improved value or "betterment" of the property affected.

That social questions were pressing themselves to the front, and that the Radical members would be the first to feel the pressure from their constituents, was apparent in Mr. Morley's address at the opening of a new political club at Middlesborough (Nov. 6), when he dwelt upon the conditions of popular government. Any policy, he said, that did not lead to content was absolutely unworthy of any serious statesman or any wise ruler. The goodwill and the co-operation of Ireland formed the only foundation upon which any remedial policy could be built. It was a pity that this great controversy should be prolonged, because we had at this moment what we might not always have—exceptionally favourable conditions for harmonising the goodwill of Ireland

with reform in Irish government. It was mere hypocrisy and cant for the Unionists to say that the Home Rulers did not know what they meant by Home Rule, and he declared that the Unionist demand for details was not made in good faith. No doubt, whatever scheme or plan might be adopted, some possible logical anomalies would be left, but no anomaly would be left which was so anomalous as the anomaly which faced the House of Commons every day. He was anxious to get the Irish question out of the way, because there were other questions waiting at the door, and he wanted to have leisure and freedom of mind to be able to face those new problems which were surging in upon us. The Liberal party, he maintained, were fighting the old battle of freedom against oppression.

Mr. W. H. Smith at any rate was as anxious as Mr. Morley to obtain the time and attention of Parliament for the consideration of questions other than those relating to Ireland, on which, and on all others, the Gladstonians bestowed such elaborate and diffuse speech, not unfrequently "smothering them with love." In his address at Glasgow to the Conservative Associations of Scotland (Nov. 5), Mr. Smith pointed out the extraordinary services which Mr. Goschen had rendered to the finance of the nation by extinguishing four millions sterling of taxes, providing for an additional expenditure of two millions sterling, and granting two millions and a half sterling to reduce the local rates, and all this without adding anything to the burdens of the country, except about 800,000*l.* on real property and 300,000*l.* on beer. Mr. W. H. Smith further insisted that the Union between Scotland and England had been ultimately brought about by a proposal in the English Parliament to inquire into the action of the Scotch Parliament. A fierce dispute arose between the two nations; and the Scotch Estates having threatened to form an alliance of their own, it was obvious that nothing but their union with the Parliament of England could keep peace between the two countries. Mr. Smith argued that there was nothing to lead one to suppose that different results would now follow from a divided authority. Under Home Rule, instead of obtaining control over our own Parliament, we should be debating almost exclusively in the English Parliament the affairs of Scotland and Ireland.

In the mind, however, of Earl Spencer, who had administered the government of Ireland for Mr. Gladstone with considerable rigour, there were no such misgivings as to the benefits which would follow from a complete change of policy with regard to that country. He said that years ago, when he knew less of Ireland and those who advised the Government than he did now, he heard and believed that they had only to put down the Land League to maintain law and order, and the whole population would dance for joy and rejoice at the relief. But he was, as Mr. Goschen was now, in a fool's paradise. He admitted there had been improvement in Ireland, and it was possible exceptional

criminal legislation had often temporarily reduced crime, but at this time the improved condition of the agricultural classes had a great deal to do with the improvement in the state of the country. He attached immense importance to the growing and increasing cordiality which had sprung up between the Liberal party and the National party in Ireland.

This weary see-saw of assertion and contradiction in the way of both facts and forecasts was relieved by the proceedings of a conference of the Liberal Unionists and Conservatives of Birmingham (Nov. 4), on the subject of their respective preponderance, the latter being represented by only one member as compared with six Liberal Unionists. They insisted, therefore, that in spite of the general understanding arrived at in 1885, they were entitled to at least one more seat in the representation of the city. Mr. Chamberlain urged that the Parliamentary influence of the Liberal Unionists depended largely on the numbers returned by Birmingham, for in London and other parts of the country the party was scarcely represented at all. He also suggested, in a spirit of conciliation, that the delegates should go back to their constituents and consult whether they would have a house to house canvass of Central Birmingham to decide on the course to be adopted, or would refer the matter to the joint arbitration of Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington. This course was ultimately adopted, but the award was not made before the close of the year.

Another deviation from the stock-subject of political speeches was made by Lord Salisbury at the annual Guildhall banquet (Nov. 9), when he spoke only as Foreign Secretary; but, like many speeches delivered on similar occasions, after exciting much expectation it greatly disappointed the prophets of both good and evil things. He congratulated his hearers on the signs of increasing industry and prosperity—and added for their comfort that “the barometer is distinctly rising in the scale of peace.” He put aside as not needing very serious consideration the recent outbreak in Crete, and he knew of no other trouble threatening the peace of Europe. Africa, he declared, occupied the attention of Foreign Offices more than any other subject just at present, and the question most interesting to Englishmen in relation to Africa was as to how far we should be able to suppress the slave trade. He thought the success attained in this respect of late years had been greater than for many years before, and he pointed to the conference which was to meet at Brussels during the present month to deal with the subject—a conference such as had never met before—as a proof of this success. Such a conference on the slave trade marked a great advance in general European opinion on the point. He thanked the Sultan of Zanzibar for abolishing the slave trade in his territory—a step which would destroy slavery in one of the richest markets to which slaves had hitherto been taken. Lord Salisbury went on

to refer to the recent visit of the Prince of Wales to Egypt, and to the improvement which had been brought about in that country, where peace had been restored, order had been upheld, corruption had been driven from the inferior tribunals, financial equilibrium had taken the place of financial disorder, and there was good hope of commencing the beneficent task of remitting the taxes which pressed so heavily upon the fellahen of Egypt. He referred to recent military operations to show that it was impossible as yet for us to think of evacuating Egypt. We had undertaken to sustain Egypt until she was competent to sustain herself against every enemy, foreign or domestic, and the time had not yet arrived for us to withdraw. As to European affairs, he rejoiced over the fact that the difficulties in Crete were coming to a rapid termination, and he knew of no other disturbance in Europe. Recent events abroad had all tended in the direction of peace, and the sincere efforts of the rulers of the greater nations of Europe were unquestionable, and Lord Salisbury gave it as the belief of those European statesmen best qualified to judge that the probabilities of peace were never more hopeful.

This pronouncement was well received by the audience and by the mercantile world, as appeared by the increasing volume of trade by which the closing weeks of the year were marked. Moreover, the result more than justified Lord Salisbury's guarded hints. He had carefully avoided all allusions to the topic of Equatorial Africa or to the encroachments of Portugal in that continent, but before many weeks had passed news arrived of Major Serpa Pinto's "campaign" in Nyassaland, followed by his high-handed proceedings and insults to native chiefs who had placed themselves under British protection.

It was, however, known to the Foreign Secretary, though not to his hearers at Guildhall, that already a misunderstanding with Portugal with respect to the proceedings of that country's representative in Eastern Africa was brewing. On that very day (Nov. 9) the Portuguese Royal decree was issued, purporting to place under Portuguese administration a large territory lying on both sides of the Zambezi River. Lord Salisbury at once perceived the dangers likely to arise from any vague hints or partial acquiescence. He accordingly forthwith wrote to Mr. Petre, the British Minister, to protest against the assumption of the Portuguese Government.

"The district to which the name of Zumbo is given appears to comprise a great part of Mashonaland and an immense tract to the northward, approaching the frontiers of the Congo Free State and the water-head of Lake Nyassa. I have to request you to remind the Portuguese Government that Mashonaland is under British influence, and to state that her Majesty's Government do not recognise a claim of Portugal to any portion of that territory. The agreement between Lobengula and Great Britain

of February 11, 1888, was duly notified to them and officially published in the Cape Colony. The agreement recorded the fact that Lobengula is ruler of Mashonaland and Makalalakaland. Her Majesty's Government are also unable to recognise the claims of Portugal to the territory to the north of the Zambesi indicated in the above-mentioned proclamation. So far as they are defined, they follow the course of the Loangwa River, on whose banks there are tribes with whom her Majesty's Government have treaties; and they appear to be inconsistent with British rights established by settlement upon the Shiré River and the coasts of Lake Nyassa. Beyond this, they assert the jurisdiction of Portugal over vast tracts which are still unoccupied, but the knowledge of which is principally due to British explorers. In August 1887 her Majesty's Government protested against any claims in no degree founded on occupation, and could not recognise the sovereignty of Portugal in territory of which she had not practically taken possession, and in which she was represented by no authority capable of exercising the ordinary rights of sovereignty. You will formally renew this protest. Her Majesty's Government recognise on the Upper Zambesi the existence of Portuguese occupation at Tete and Zumbo, but have no knowledge of the occupation of any other place or district."

For a while the public were left in ignorance of what was passing between the two Cabinets, and no doubts were entertained of the readiness of Portugal to admit the English standpoint.

The lull in speech-making, however, was not of a long duration, and in the course of the following week upwards of half a dozen Cabinet or ex-Cabinet Ministers were expounding their views in various parts of the country. Bristol was the chief scene of these displays—Mr. Goschen, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Lord Rosebery, and Mr. John Morley appearing for their respective parties—whilst at Stratford Sir Wm. Harcourt rallied the Liberals of the Home counties, and at Ipswich Mr. Balfour encouraged the Unionists of East Anglia to hold fast to their several faiths.

The business of the week was inaugurated by Lord Herschell, who had been Mr. Gladstone's Chancellor in the short-lived administration of 1885, but who, since his retirement, had displayed fairness and moderation when criticising his opponents' policy. Speaking at Reading (Nov. 11), whilst maintaining that the demand for details of Mr. Gladstone's new Bill came from those who were not entitled to an answer, he nevertheless gave his reasons for this silence. It was very desirable, he urged, that when Home Rule was given it should be given with as wide an area of consent as possible; therefore it was better that the details should be left unsettled until the principle had been accepted. He would have liked nothing better than that the question should be considered by men of all parties, including, however, the Irish party as well as others. His quarrel with the present "coercion" in Ireland was a legal one—viz. that men unversed

in law were set to administer the law of conspiracy, which involved difficult and subtle questions. But his chief complaint was the absence of a jury, though he could hardly say that a jury were likely to have a keener discernment of these questions than a resident magistrate.

In making choice of Ipswich for the second time as the place of the most elaborate defence, Mr. Balfour was possibly in some degree influenced by the fact that it was to the East-Anglian Liberals nearly four years before that Mr. John Morley had made the memorable speech at Chelmsford which marked the adhesion of the English Radicals to the Irish National programme. If the Essex Liberals on that occasion had shown enthusiasm and given promise of support, it was important that the rest of England should know that they did not represent the unanimous opinion of the Eastern counties. On this occasion, therefore (Nov. 12), Mr. Balfour was received with more than usual ceremony, the Conservative associations of the whole Fen country sending deputations to the meeting. His more immediate object, however, was to consolidate the alliance between the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists, his presence being, in fact, due to the invitation of the latter. He began his speech by expressing regret at the course of misrepresentation and calumny with which the Opposition conducted the political campaign. He would willingly leave personal controversy on one side, but could not ignore Mr. Gladstone's attack at Southport. Mr. Gladstone had reproached the Conservative Government with passing the Crimes Act of 1887, in the absence of discussion by the Irish members, by carrying the closure. Yet the Crimes Act of 1882 was passed after a resolution had been carried excluding the leaders of the Nationalist party and others from the House of Commons. But the real question they had to discuss was not how the Crimes Act was passed, but how it was administered, and what were its results. Having pointed out that in Kerry alone, a county probably not larger than Suffolk, the numerous criminals concerned in four murders and six murderous attacks had been brought to justice who without the Act would never have been punished at all, Mr. Balfour passed on to the manner in which the Government had dealt with criminal combinations. Mr. Gladstone complained of the way in which they had acted towards the suppressed branches of the National League, but if anything like that league, as it existed in Kerry or Clare, was found in England or Scotland, the law would have interfered without any Crimes Act at all, for the Government had only interfered with the National League where it carried out its objects by criminal methods. Dealing next with the Plan of Campaign, which Mr. Gladstone said was "extra legal," apparently because he did not wish to be too hard on it, Mr. Balfour said it was not a spontaneous combination among the peasants, but was forced on them from outside by interested politicians, and was directed, not

against bad landlords, but against those who happened to be specially powerless to resist such a combination. What was Mr. Gladstone's reason for saying that it, though illegal, was forced on Ireland by the action of the Tory Government in 1886? It was that Mr. Parnell's Bill dealing with the difficulties of the tenant had been rejected. Mr. Balfour then examined two test cases—those of the Ponsonby and Olphert estates—showing that, instead of asking for their dues as prescribed by the Act of 1884, the landlords had offered to accept almost nominal terms from their tenants. Was not Mr. Gladstone sufficiently aware of his power to know that by his excuses or semi-excuses for the Plan of Campaign he was encouraging a combination which had no analogy with anything in England or Scotland, but which had led to every form of Irish agrarian crime on every estate on which it had been started? As to Mr. Gladstone's view of boycotting, Mr. Balfour quoted Sir G. Trevelyan's definition after he left office in 1885, but before he became a Home Ruler :—

“Boycotting is cutting off all communication and all the advantages of civilisation and all the means of life from those people who have taken farms which the National League did not intend they should take, and from all people who communicate with them, or deal with them, or work for them. These wretched people are called ‘land grabbers,’ and they are denounced to the vengeance of the mob in printed notices and in violent speeches.”

When Lord Spencer was in Ireland, to issue those notices and make those speeches was a punishable and very effectually punished offence. What did Sir George and Lord Spencer say to Mr. Gladstone's speech at Southport? There appeared to be a kind of division of labour, Mr. Gladstone doing all the attack on the administration so far as it was exactly similar to that of Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan, and the two latter carefully avoiding anything which they were not reluctant should be said by Mr. Gladstone, but which would bring them into hopeless contempt. Mr. Gladstone said the rights of Englishmen in respect of exclusive dealing were not those of Irishmen. Mr. Balfour granted that, but retorted that it was the Nationalist members, and those whom they represented, who prevented their being the rights of Irishmen. Mr. Gladstone attributed the improvement in Ireland to three causes—the teaching of the priests, the teaching of the Irish members, and the remedial measures he had himself passed. As to the first, Mr. Balfour admitted that many of the priests had done their very best to check outbreaks of crime, and that many more had been carried away by the popular stream, but he could not admit that any large part of the improvement was due to the priests. He could not forget that an Irish archbishop had openly declared his approval of violent and forcible resistance to the process of the law, and that Father McFadden had recently pleaded guilty to a

breach of the law. As to the second, it would be unbecoming to dwell on the point while the Parnell Commission was sitting, but he found it impossible to improve on Mr. Gladstone's statement that crime dogged the steps of the association inseparably associated with the Nationalist members. As to the third point, figures did not bear out Mr. Gladstone's contention. When Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1868 crime began to rise; in 1869, with the disestablishment of the Irish Church, it rose from 767 to 1,329, but fell to 373 with the passing of the Crimes Act in 1870. Falling to 136 in 1875, the stringency of the Act was relaxed, and it gradually rose to 301 in 1878 and 863 in 1879. When he returned to office in 1880 crime rose to 2,585, and 4,439 the next year; but with the passing of a Coercion Bill it fell to 3,433 in 1882, 870 in 1883, 762 in 1881. It was 660 in 1888, though Mr. Gladstone erroneously quoted figures as 770. There was a direct and immediate connection between a Coercion Act and the diminution of crime; but the generation now growing up in Ireland had been brought up under the pernicious and destructive teaching of the National League, and they must not suppose that the evil teaching of the last ten years could be wiped out by one, two, three, or four years of courageous government.

This speech was naturally welcomed by the Unionist organs of all shades as further evidence of the open dealing and success of Mr. Balfour's Irish policy; and it was rather remarkable that the Opposition papers, in dealing with it, carefully avoided coming to close quarters with their antagonists. They preferred to ridicule his pretensions and generally charge him with "bullying and bolting," comparing him unfavourably with Lord Spencer, who stuck to his guns and never showed signs of fear—a compliment which read somewhat awry by the light of the ex-Viceroy's subsequent political conduct.

Sir Wm. Harcourt, speaking on the same evening (Nov. 12) at Stratford-by-Bow, rather ostentatiously avoided the Irish question, and found in the difficulties attendant on the hits of the "National party" a fruitful theme for his sarcasm. He was especially bitter against Mr. Chamberlain "with his overbearing and dictatorial style," and prophesied that the Conservatives would not find him a very easy gentleman to act with. He then went on to speak of the pressing requirements of the moment: the improved system of registration; the one-man-one vote principle; and in the place of the voluntary allotments, of which the Conservatives talked so much, a system such as existed in Switzerland, by which a man might have a right to such a portion of the soil as he could fairly cultivate.

On the same evening also, in the far west, at Bristol, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was speaking on behalf of the Liberal Unionists, setting himself in the main to reply to Mr. Morley's speech delivered in the same hall about a fortnight

earlier. Mr. Goschen without preface at once grappled with the Irish question, and replied to Mr. Morley's sneer levelled against the distrust of juries in Ireland by pointing out how, in similar cases, there was much the same amount of distrust of juries in the United States, more jurors having been challenged in the Cronin trial, for instance, and told to stand aside, than in any trial in Ireland. Mr. Goschen took very calmly the imprisonment of twenty-two Irish members of Parliament for short terms for misleading the people of Ireland into resistance to the law. They could hardly, he said, have better deserved punishment than by so misleading an ignorant peasantry. He quoted a municipal election in a town of Kerry, in which two Unionists had beaten the Nationalist, who was last year at the top of the poll with a great majority, as proof that popular feeling was returning into more loyal channels in Ireland; and he added that letters from Ireland asserted that tenants had not exhibited such cheerful and pleasant faces for eleven years back. In regard to Mr. Morley's remark that to discover a passable State legislature and administration for Ireland was a much easier task than was the construction of the United States Constitution, Mr. Goschen declared that, on the contrary, he thought the latter much the easier task of the two, for it did not involve the breaking-up of a great historical Constitution in order to find room in it for a brand-new State quite without any natural links to the political world with which it was to be loosely associated.

On the following day (Nov. 13) "Colston's Day" gave the orators of both parties the opportunity of simultaneously expressing their views in the presence of audiences of which the sympathy was assured beforehand. At the Dolphin Society's dinner Mr. Goschen gave way to his colleague Sir M. Hicks-Beach, but later in the evening he took advantage of the opportunity to reaffirm and defend his statement that the actual number of acres under cultivation in Ireland was greater than at any previous period of the century. This assertion the Gladstonian speakers had repeatedly and even passionately denied. But Mr. Goschen pointed to statistics and returns, made by officers whose trustworthiness there was no reason to suspect. On the burning question of a fusion between the Liberal Unionists and the Conservatives, Mr. Goschen expressed himself warily, holding that to be a question which depended as much, if not more, upon the rank and file than upon the leaders of the party. Meanwhile he appealed to the Statute Book as "a record of the fidelity and strength of the Unionist alliance."

It was on this point that Sir M. Hicks-Beach, who had preceded, spoke at great length and with obvious interest. He began by recalling the fact that the Government was now entering upon a fourth year of existence, and as time had gone by there had been shown a closer approximation between the

two parties of the House of Commons who supported the Government and an increasing loyalty to the Government on the part of the Liberal Unionists. He expressed a fervent hope that at the General Election the two parties might be fused. They were united as one man in defence of the unity of the kingdom, and their union in principle and opinion on other matters had become more clearly apparent. There was only one thing which seemed to stand in the way of complete union, and that was the question of name. He could quite understand that Liberal Unionists did not want to be called Tories, but the party might be called the Unionist party. This was a question of very grave importance to the future of the country, for he did not believe that the Cabinet could fight with its full strength if certain men whose names would readily occur to anyone were left outside the Cabinet. Lord Salisbury had expressed his willingness to give up the first place in the country to Lord Hartington if by so doing he could secure his co-operation in the government, and this was very different from the conduct of Mr. Gladstone when Lord Hartington, who had borne all the toil and peril of the leadership for six long years, was calmly supplanted in 1880. The President of the Board of Trade next denounced some of the dangerous socialistic doctrines which were now being propagated, especially in regard to the ownership of land. On other questions also of vital social importance, such as putting an end to the horrors of the sweating system and improving the sanitary condition of the dwellings of the poor, the Liberal Unionists and the Conservatives were also at one.

At the Anchor Society, where the Bristol Liberals were met together, Lord Rosebery was the chief guest of the evening, and unrestrained by the responsibilities of office he was able to freely criticise his opponents. He vehemently protested against Mr. Goschen's suggestion that the Gladstonian Liberals had in view any great constitutional revolution. They were not going to alter Magna Charta, nor Habeas Corpus, nor trial by jury, nor to abolish the Throne, the Lords, or the Commons. All they aimed at was the amendment of an Act passed alike by the English and Irish legislatures ninety years previously without any direct appeal to or sanction by the people. In reference to foreign affairs, he regretted that the Prime Minister should have spoken so lightly, in his Mansion House speech, of the difficulties which had been going on in Crete, and that he should have described as "a faction fight" a civil war which could hardly have come to a more sanguinary, disastrous, and horrible termination. As to affairs in Africa, Lord Rosebery expressed some doubt as to the expediency of the course which had been pursued in handing over a territory as large as France to an association of shareholders of which there were to be three irremovable directors appointed for life. Dealing next with domestic affairs, the noble lord proceeded to ridicule the Sugar

Convention, laughed at the unavailing efforts of the Government to pass a Tithes Bill and a Land Transfer Bill (the latter having been "strangled by its friends in the presence of its own parent"), and bantered the Government and the Unionist party on the result of the recent by-elections. Next he indicated some of the leading features of the new Liberal programme, including the Irish question, the liquor traffic, land reform, registration, payment of members, reforms for the metropolis, disestablishment in Scotland and Wales, a "drastic reform" of the House of Lords, and the series of what he described as "workmen's questions." Then he bantered the Unionists on their want of union in Birmingham, and finally settled down to the Irish question. The Act of Union, he said, was a part of the constitution which was "sown in corruption and raised in dishonour," which was "carried by means that would invalidate the humblest statute on the Statute Book," and which was "destitute of all sanction but that of open bribery and sealed with the indignation of a betrayed nationality." But Lord Rosebery, for some unexplained cause, departed from the usual courtesy and good temper by which his attacks on his political opponents had generally been marked—not only in his reference to Mr. Goschen and Lord Hartington, but more especially when he declared that in the Unionists' deliberations he saw nothing but "hatred all round—hatred to Ireland, hatred to Mr. Gladstone, hatred to each other." Like other speakers on the same side, Lord Rosebery, although his speech was much prolonged, ignored the difficulties which, said Mr. Gladstone in 1886, surpassed the wit of man, and contented himself with assuring his hearers that the Irish members would be retained at Westminster, whilst legislating also with complete freedom in Dublin.

Having regaled the Unionists of Bristol with two speeches, Mr. Goschen passed over to South Wales to urge upon both sections of the party the necessity of organisation and harmony, and drawing from his opponents the lesson of the need of unity and firmness of purpose. At Cardiff (Nov. 15) the Chancellor of the Exchequer urged upon his hearers the demoralising influence of the Home Rule cry upon political questions. It was no longer enough to show that Welsh taxpayers had been relieved in the same proportion as their English brothers; they wanted something of their own in which the other parts of the country did not share. In this sense the Welsh Intermediate Education Act and the Coal Mines' Regulation Act had been passed; but he would rather that Wales should feel, with the rest of England, the benefits she derived from stronger hands and a dwindling debt. Assuming, for argument's sake, the possibility of the return of the Liberals to power, he sketched a new Gladstonian Government as consisting in the main of Mr. Gladstone, controlled by Mr. Parnell; Mr. John Morley, controlled by Mr. Burns and the Socialists; Mr. Arnold Morley,

the Opposition whip, controlled by Mr. Jacoby, the whip of the new Radicals ; Lord Herschell, controlled by Mr. Healy ; Lord Rosebery, controlled by Mr. Labouchere ; a Secretary for War, controlled by Sir Wilfrid Lawson ; and Sir William Harcourt, uncontrolled by anybody. Speaking in the evening at Swansea, Mr. Goschen drew attention to the fact that the Gladstonian leaders were now raising other questions than the Irish one, because they had on the Irish question been argumentatively silenced, and had found that the constituencies were tired of it. He congratulated the country on the revival of commercial prosperity and the increase of national wealth ; but he hoped that the prosperity now springing up would not be turned to extravagance. He trusted, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if there should be a surplus, or series of surpluses, they would rather be utilised for the diminution of national burdens than for the increase of the expenditure of the country. The present Government, while they had not stinted the wants of the country in regard to the army and navy, had reduced the civil service expenditure of the country by an average of 300,000*l.* a year, and in four years there had been a difference of almost half a million a year in the cost of the ordinary government of the country. On the other hand, he was not sorry to find that there had been an increase of 400,000*l.* in the expenditure upon education.

In a subsequent speech, also at Swansea, Mr. Goschen, with unwonted force and animation, set himself to prove to his hearers that the Home Rule programme in its revised form really meant that the Constitution must be taken to pieces. If the Irish members, having a Parliament of their own for settling Irish education, were to determine the principles of Scotch education by their votes in the Parliament at Westminster, it was, he argued, simply preposterous to deny that the Scotch would kick against such injustice, and would demand a Parliament of their own too, to settle the principles of their own education ; and so it would and must happen that Home Rule for Ireland would involve Home Rule for Scotland and for Wales ; we should then have not only an Irish Parliament and Executive, but two or three other Parliaments and Executives, all of them jostling each other. In addition to these gigantic changes, there was, according to the Radical programme, to be a revolution in relation to the House of Lords, payment of members in the House of Commons, and various other fundamental alterations. In conclusion, he referred to the return of prosperity and the growth of trade as subjects of more modified congratulation for a Chancellor of the Exchequer than for the rest of the world, inasmuch as the possibility of a surplus made it less easy for him to resist demands for increased expenditure and to keep the surplus intact for the remission of public burdens.

It was with a sense of relief that many, either already con-

vinced or wholly indifferent in regard to Ireland, found that Lord Derby in addressing the Chamber of Commerce at Rochdale (Nov. 13) and Lord Rosebery when speaking to the Imperial Federation League at the Mansion House (Nov. 15) could find some less threadbare topics than the Irish question. Lord Rosebery had recognised these signs of weariness at Bristol, where he aimed at diverting attention from it and magnifying the Liberal policy on other questions. Lord Derby, as the candid friend of both political parties, endeavoured to bring his hearers to the consideration of questions personal to themselves. He scoffed at the idea of any Parliament tampering with the sound principles of free trade, but he admitted that in view of our rapidly increasing population a serious danger arose from overcrowding. In view of foreign competition, of which the severity would increase with years, he urged the reduction of our public burdens, so that our successors might not at least be unduly weighted in the race. Anxious to make the transfer of land more easy, Lord Derby declined to discuss what was vaguely called the nationalisation of the land, because no two people were agreed as to the meaning of the phrase. He thought that as a rule leaseholders were quite able to take care of themselves in large towns, and he believed Parliament would hesitate before interfering to break deliberate bargains in order that leaseholders might obtain what they did not bargain for at less than the market price. He would, however, have no objection to laying down a rule by which no leases should be granted for less than 999 years.

As to the claims which were being raised on behalf of labour, he asked whether the demand for eight hours a day was to be accompanied by the enforcement of a minimum rate of wages. If not the reduction of hours from ten to eight would simply result in knocking off 20 per cent. from the working-man's wages. But if a minimum was to be enforced, it would lead to endless complications, and would be very hard on the inferior workman, who would not be employed at all. In a similar fashion Lord Derby disposed of the proposal to build dwellings for the poor and let them at the lowest price. If that were done locally, it would attract an influx of labour which was not wanted. If it were done generally, it would undersell the people whose business it was to provide lodgings. People might talk slightly of economical laws, but such laws were only the application of reason to a particular department of human affairs. The proper direction in which we ought to look for a solution of the labour controversy was that of co-operation or profit-sharing.

Although there was nothing very important in Lord Rosebery's address to the Imperial Federation League, it was interesting as showing the very marked divergence in the views on colonial policy held by the leaders of the Liberal party. He admitted that there were strong reasons for any specific plan or programme, but he declared that inasmuch as "trade followed

the flag," the first task of imperial or national federation was to preserve and maintain the flag. He was in favour of holding periodical colonial conferences in order to ascertain how far federated action could be carried out in such matters as imperial defence, postage and telegraphs, and the great social problem of the time,—the relation of capital and labour. If the conferences were of no avail in advancing the solution of these questions, it would prove to the world that imperial federation in any form was an impossible dream. This policy was cordially endorsed by Lord Carnarvon, who pointed to the intercolonial federation going on in Australia as the condition precedent and indispensable to imperial federation. The correspondence published about this showed that the political leaders in the Australian colonies were already recognising the advantages which might arise from a closer union and a common understanding upon matters like colonial defence, although for the present the establishment of a Customs Union seemed unrealisable.

At home, however, political questions were temporarily thrown into the background by the attitude taken up by certain trades towards their employers. The success which had attended the dockers in their efforts to obtain better terms, although partial misunderstandings kept alive the quarrel for some weeks, naturally emboldened men who in other trades worked under peculiarly disadvantageous conditions to resort to similar means. The journeyman bakers of London, chiefly recruited from among the German immigrants, formed a union and insisted upon a reduction of their labour to sixty hours a week. In the richer quarters of the metropolis, where the price of bread had in no sense followed the fall in the price of wheat, the masters after a very brief discussion consented to the terms proposed. But in South London and at the East End the bakers met the demand by raising the price of the quartern loaf by one halfpenny. Popular sympathy with the strikers was at once modified; but with strict impartiality the shops of the bakers refusing to treat with their men were threatened with boycotting or worse. By a fatality or intention the other two fields chosen by the Trades Unionists for the struggle between capital and labour were those in which there were no middlemen—as in the dockers' strike—to come between the producers and the consumers. The men employed by the London Road Car Company and various tramway companies had received encouragement from the public in their demands for shorter hours, and the directors recognising the strength of their employes came to an understanding with them. The concession, however, of the full demands of the men, involving the introduction of the shift system, would, it was shown to the men, have rendered the continued existence of the companies precarious, and would have certainly deprived the shareholders of any return on their capital. In the struggle, however, between the gas companies and their men popular

•

feeling was clearly with the companies, and the unanimity with which a combination having for its object to place Leeds, Manchester, and South London in darkness was condemned showed the limits of public sympathy in struggles of this kind. The question at issue, moreover, in South London at least, was rather one of sentiment than of increased pay or reduced hours. The company, anxious to guard itself against the difficulties arising out of a concerted strike, even at the expiration of the notice required by law, proposed to substitute annual agreements, with three months' notice, for the existing weekly hiring. In return for this protection of their shareholders' interest and the public convenience, the directors offered to associate the men in a share of the profits by the creation of a bonus fund, in which all who subscribed to the other conditions and acted up to them might on death or resignation participate. The Gas Stokers' Union saw in this proposal only the means of getting the workmen more completely within the power of the company; they, therefore, called upon their men to give three weeks' notice, and to come out if the proposal was not withdrawn. Unfortunately for themselves, the terms which the South Metropolitan Car Company was able to offer attracted a crowd of volunteers, and when the last of the Unionmen had left the yards their places were at once filled by men who, if inexperienced, were willing to be taught in order to ensure permanent employment. At Leeds and Manchester the men after a few weeks had been forced to give way, and probably not a few of those who had lost their places in the north were glad enough to accept work in the south. In any case, none of the annoyance experienced at Manchester, where for some days there had been a serious dearth of gas, was repeated in London. Throughout the struggle, which lasted until the close of the year, no suggestion was made through the ordinary channels that the consumers should submit to an increase in the cost of their gas or the shareholders to a reduction of their dividends, in order to provide by means of a larger outlay for the benefit of the workmen. On both sides it was recognised that the present struggle was for mastery, not for money, the last point on which the Strikes Committee insisted, after all others had been abandoned, being that the notices of withdrawal should all take effect on the same day.

We must, however, return once more to the political arena, where the spectators on both sides were expressing more or less audibly their requests for something more definite from the Liberal speakers than mere denunciations of tyranny or the repetition of familiar outrages. By the Liberal organs even it was hinted that the meeting of the Liberal Federal Union was the proper place for any such unfolding of the new scheme, and Liberals throughout the country were urged to await the issue with patience. Meanwhile one of the shrewdest of the Liberal leaders, Mr. Henry Fowler, speaking at Coventry on the same day as Mr.

Goschen (Nov. 15), asserted that the grant of a separate Irish Parliament would not give any undue weight to Irish members sitting at Westminster. It mattered not, he said, whether Dublin Castle or the Dublin Parliament were the delegate of Westminster—in either case the Imperial Parliament would be supreme—but instead of controlling the Lord Lieutenant, it would control the Irish Executive, or would override the policy of the Irish Parliament. He further contended—and for this purpose he accepted the estimate of his opponents—that Mr. Balfour would find a prosperous Ireland far more difficult to govern than a suffering Ireland had been, and that a return of commercial activity would render the government of the country under the present system far more instead of far less difficult.

Mr. John Morley speaking at the Eighty Club (Nov. 19), disappointed those who anticipated any hint from him of his disagreement with the other leaders of the party. He carefully avoided the Irish question, and directed the attention of his hearers to the social problems of the day, which were pressing more and more upon men's minds, and threatened in the near future to disturb the contentment of capitalists. He denied that he was a Socialist, being satisfied with the name of Radical. Moreover if Socialism implied any denial of the principle of private property and the assumption and administration by the State of all land and capital, if it meant an equal distribution of products, then it could, he said, only produce convulsion and disaster. But if Socialism meant a wise use of the forces of all for the good of each, if it meant the legal protection of the weak against the strong, if it meant the performance by public bodies of duties which individuals could perform either not as well or not at all for themselves, then its principles were admitted all over the field of our social activity. With regard to the surplus foreshadowed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Morley suggested that at least half of the duty on tea, coffee, and cocoa, which produced £,750,000/, might be remitted, and a step made towards a free breakfast table. If man must indulge in excess, tea, he thought, was about the best thing in which to exceed. Shortly there would, he thought, also be a demand upon the Exchequer for free education. But the proper results of a national system of education would, he contended, never be achieved, the abolition even of the school pence would never be accomplished, until all the schools receiving public aid were placed under the local representative authority. In London there were 40,000 children going to the elementary schools every morning starving. An experiment of providing free meals was about to be tried in London by carefully organised public benevolence. In Birmingham the experiment had been declared not to have had a pauperising influence. Directly the parents procured work, they removed their children from this

benefaction. The utmost that had been proposed was that school boards should aid these efforts. No proposal had been made by responsible men for paying for the food of children whose parents were able to pay for it. Many powers might safely be entrusted to local bodies which would be mischievous and dangerous in the hands of the central government. Thus all local bodies ought, he argued, to have the power of acquiring certain great monopolies and of obtaining land for public purposes without paying an exorbitant fine. However, in effecting these improvements, care must be taken not to rate people to death, which would not occur if the right people were rated. For instance, those persons who had the value of their property enhanced by an improvement should contribute towards it. On this point he also advocated the rating of vacant land. Moreover, land and personalty must be placed on an equal footing as regards the death duties. In local matters the parish must, he argued, be recognised, both for purposes of local administration and as a political training, and as the effective emancipation of the rural population. These parish councils should be enabled to purchase land for letting purposes by a cheap and effective process. If villagers were allowed to have a voice in the affairs of the nation, he thought they might well have a voice in the affairs of their own parish; and he was informed that a parish council would be extremely stern to all improper receivers of relief, though they might be lenient to misfortune. After remarking on the great stir and ferment of labour, he said that wages were the great master-key of social improvement at this stage. Mr. Morley went on to notice that the great terror of workmen was not so much low wages as unsteady wages, and for this he had no panacea.

By a coincidence Mr. John Morley's predecessor in the Chief Secretaryship, and a rival candidate for Mr. Gladstone's inheritance, Sir George Trevelyan, was speaking on the same evening in Glasgow, and although the circumstances of his visit to his constituents offered him an obvious opportunity for discussing economic, not social questions, as raised by the education policy of the Government, he carefully avoided all such topics, and turned to the political questions upon which parties were most keenly divided. He reminded his hearers in starting that the Liberal party held that in all three kingdoms alike there was that state of things that all the religious endowments of each country were applied to the advantages of one denomination alone, and in the case of England and Wales to the richest of all denominations. If the established clergymen of the Church of Wales could not get their tithes, and they were so poor (considering the poor miners and small farmers of Wales maintained their ministers), the landowners and mineowners who had the superfluous wealth of the country ought to take upon themselves to maintain their clergymen likewise. The whole

responsibility of what was going on in Wales rested on the shoulders of those who kept up religious privileges in Wales. It was the business of a statesman to see that the large part of the community should not be forced to pay for the worship of the minority of the community. The Liberal party was now on strong ground, and it had become a disestablishment party. He could not conceive how the Church of Scotland should receive 16,000*l.* a year out of the imperial taxes, as she did at the present moment. It was as bad for the Church as it was for the public. It was one of those things which were bad for those who gave and for those who received. If the Liberal party were to be a party having the confidence of the bulk of the public they must boldly proclaim themselves against religious privileges. As to the Land Purchase Bill, he objected to the money and credit and imperial taxes of the country going to purchase Irish land, and it was a scandal that nearly 1,000,000*l.* of public money should be paid over to five landlords. The landlords could not get a purchaser in the open market for their land, and the Government proposed to relieve them of their burden. The Government proposed that the ratepayers should become the landlords, which meant that the ratepayers would have to insist upon exacting the utmost farthing from the tenants. If the price of cattle and oats fell they would require to insist upon everything that was due, or else the scheme would become bankrupt. If Ireland thought it best to buy out the landlords, they should be paid on Irish credit; and if she wanted to drain the land, she should do it with Irish energy and with Irish money. What the Liberals wanted was that the expenditure on Irish resources and Irish objects should be according to Irish ideas, and by an Irish Executive responsible to an Irish Parliament. Speaking on the Royal grants, Sir George Trevelyan said the money paid annually to the Royal family was nearly three-quarters of a million, sufficient to give each member of Parliament a salary of 1,200*l.* As to the proposal of the Government to extend these Royal grants to the grandchildren, and possibly to the great-grandchildren, of the Sovereign, the Liberal party were determined that it should not be acted upon. Next to the Irish question, the most important question for the future was the Electoral Reform Bill, which pass they must.

Three days later Lord Rosebery met (Nov. 22) in the same city the delegates of the Scotch Liberal Associations, from whom he obtained a programme which was merely a logical consequence of the Irish Home Rule policy as generally accepted. The delegates unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that "the true solution of the question may be found in granting Home Rule legislatures on a federal basis to Scotland, England, Ireland, and Wales." As a corollary they demanded the disestablishment of the Scotch Church, triennial parliaments, payment of members, and other points of the new Radical charter.

Lord Rosebery, whilst not expressing his disapproval of any of these changes, regretted the omission of what he considered the most necessary of all, "the radical and drastic reform of the Second Chamber." He entirely agreed with the main proposition that Irish Home Rule was only to be had by the conversion of the British Empire into a British federation, and expressed his wish that "the three kingdoms now united were on the footing of the States of America, in which each has its local legislature, and which are bound by a common legislature." Not only, however, did Lord Rosebery omit all reference to Wales, but he recognised the difficulty which lay in the way of the Scotch programme. "It means," he said, "a local parliament for England, which England does not want, and which England in its present mood is determined not to have." Nor did Lord Rosebery appear to think that Scotch opinion on this point was unanimous, for he plainly told the delegates:—"You will have to get the thinking heads of the country, you will have to get the municipalities, you will have to get the chambers of commerce, you will have to get the large bodies who represent the intelligence and the industry of the country, to join in that demand before English opinion will think it is thoroughly well matured." The cases of Scotland and Ireland, moreover, he considered to be very different; for, whereas the case of Ireland was one of oppression, that of Scotland was one of neglect, and for himself he expressly declared that he did not wish to see the restoration of the old Scottish Parliament, which would be "an unhappy combination of the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and the General Assembly."

Up to this time the speeches of the recess had been delivered with rare exceptions by the lieutenants on either side, and the captains when forced to speak had managed to say as little as possible. The time, however, was now drawing near when the two great parties were to meet in solemn assembly to take stock of the past and to lay plans and propose programmes for the future. Nottingham was chosen for the conference of the Conservative and Unionist Associations, Manchester for the meeting of the National Liberal Federation. It was known that Lord Salisbury would attend the one and Mr. Gladstone the other. Expectation was aroused on both sides; and by his own adherents as strongly as by his opponents Mr. Gladstone was called upon to give some idea of what he wished his followers and the still hesitating Liberals to understand by the Home Rule he would give to Ireland if once more installed in office. Among the Unionists also there was a certain impatience to know whether the tentative suggestions concerning the formation of a "National party" were endorsed in high places. In order to obtain a definite pronouncement on this point the Nottingham conference (Nov. 26), numbering between 700 and 800 delegates, under the presidency of Sir A. Rollit, M.P., resolved that, "recognising the

importance of a programme common to both Conservative and Liberal Unionists, it is of opinion that it would be of considerable advantage to the Unionist cause if steps were taken to carry out the suggestion that has been made as to the formation of a National party." Other resolutions were passed for regulating and, if necessary, prohibiting the settlement in the towns of England of pauper aliens; for dealing with tithes, seamen's votes, land transfer, and merchandise marks; but a resolution in favour of a "free breakfast table" was not put to the vote. Lord Salisbury, in addressing the delegates, avoided a definite opinion on the resolutions, and contented himself with assuring his hearers that in the general current of opinion on the great subject of the day there was every cause for congratulation. Not only amongst their friends, but amongst their enemies, the conviction was slowly making its way that Mr. Gladstone's separatist propositions were impossible. As to the few by-elections, they were not taken upon any great national questions. "Look across the Channel. Less than a year ago by-election after by-election seemed to indicate that the present form of government in France was condemned. But now its supporters had won a victory which, in the opinion of those best competent to judge, has at all events finally disposed of the particular antagonist with whom they had to deal." Lord Salisbury also protested against the supposition that the next election should be the be-all and the end-all of political effort. If they won it, their pertinacious enemy would continue as pertinacious as before. Lord Salisbury proceeded to express his approval of the project for the formation of a great national party. Amid loud denials he said he had always thought that it might facilitate that result if some other person than himself occupied his position. He urged, however, that the decision of this great question did not lie with statesmen or politicians, but with the great parties themselves. A great national party could not be created by any set of men; it must grow.

In the evening of the same day Lord Salisbury was warmly received by a mass meeting, estimated at 12,000 persons, to whom he spoke at great length on the current subjects of the hour, admitting that the settlement of the Irish question must be the first for consideration; although it would be unjust to withdraw from consideration the problems concerning England and Scotland. Undoubtedly, he said, the question of the moment was that of wages. Everybody would sympathise with the desire of the working man to improve his own position by the exertion of his own faculties and his own industry, but the amount of wages which the working man would receive depended, like everything else, upon the laws of demand and supply, and upon the laws of the markets. In any policy they must, above all things, be careful not to destroy employment, to drive capital out of the market. An Eight Hours Bill would be, he thought, a very great

mistake, though he did not for a moment say that there was not a great deal of too long work in a great many trades. With regard to allotments, he said it was very possible an amendment of the new Act might be necessary; but it would be to carry out its spirit, which was to facilitate the acquisition of this very valuable addition to the workman's wages. With regard to "free education," he said the name should be "assisted education," because nobody had suggested that rich and poor alike should enjoy education at the expense of the Chancellor of the Exchequer:—

"I expressed the opinion four years ago at Newport, that by forcing the people to send their children to school, whether they ask it or not, you were incurring a certain obligation to relieve the burden of that compulsion, where the circumstances of the parent were such that it was too heavy for him to bear. We believe that considerable progress in that direction may be made. We have already introduced measures to that effect in Scotland. I believe that with perfect consistency, with sound principle, and merely recognising the fact that where you enforce a duty upon a man you are bound to make it as easy for him as you can—I believe that it will be possible considerably to extend that principle in England, and very greatly to relieve the difficulties of the working man in that respect. But allow me to say that I consider the question as to its rapidity, and as to its progress, to be a question for the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I venture to repeat that the gift of free or assisted education must be so conducted as not to diminish in the slightest degree the guarantee that we now possess for religious liberty as expressed by the voluntary schools. If it is to suppress the denominational schools, free education would be not a blessing, but a curse."

After speaking in favour of the State's giving facilities for emigration, more especially to our colonies, he referred to the state of houses for the working classes as having been regarded as of great importance by the Conservative party. When in 1885 they proposed to apply large prison spaces in London at cost price to such buildings the resistance of Liberals in the House of Commons was so severe that it was impossible to pass the clauses. Mr. Morley had proposed that, instead of rating people upon the occupation value of their houses or lands, they should be rated upon the capital value. But the objection to the scheme would be only to its partial adoption. If the question was to be set up on the most approved philosophical principles, personal property should pay its share of the rates as well as realty. But the question of housing the working classes was not solved by turning the dwellers of insanitary dwellings into the streets. Houses could only be found for them with the help of the owners and occupiers; and if there was no security these would invest their money elsewhere. Conservative policy was the policy of a party who preached confidence.

On the following day the Prime Minister made no fewer than five speeches, most of them short, but together forming a consecutive defence of the various points on which the Conservatives had been assailed. He expressed his gratitude to the Liberal Unionists for the support they had given to the policy of the Government, and proceeded to discuss current affairs. As to foreign affairs, he declared it to be a peculiarity of the office he held as Foreign Secretary that "the subjects which had most to be in his thoughts were those which had to be least upon his lips." But the guiding principle of the present Administration had been and would be to strain every nerve to be at peace with all the world, but to be always ready for the event when other nations would not be at peace with them. He humorously referred to the plans of the Gladstonian party as "undergoing a gradual but rapid change, and, just as in a dissolving view, when one picture was just melting away and another was just coming in, the combination of images was somewhat perplexing." The opponents of the Government had found that the condition of Ireland, when it ought, according to their views, to have got worse, had unfortunately got better, and they had had to change their tactics, and to introduce into their policy a trace, or more than a trace, of Socialism. He next referred to the passion of Lord Rosebery for "girding at the House of Lords," and to his recent suggestion that it would require the resurrection of Cromwell to abolish the Upper Chamber. Lord Salisbury thought it would be rather hazardous to revive Cromwell, for, though Cromwells were very powerful and effective instruments, no one knew precisely what they would do, and Cromwell, at the head of a regiment in the Houses of Parliament, might be just as likely to march into and purge the House of Commons as the other House. The difficulty of reforming the House of Lords did not spring from the Upper Chamber itself, but from the Radicals, who wished to make too sweeping changes. Any reform of the Upper Chamber which increased its efficiency must diminish the power of the House of Commons, for there was only a certain amount of political power in existence, and if more of it were given to the Lords less of it must be possessed by the Commons. In regard to the Home Rule question, Lord Salisbury pointed out that if the Irish members were to have the exclusive management of Irish concerns, and to sit at Westminster as well, and assist in the control of English affairs, thus making England "play branch-line to Ireland," that was an arrangement which would not be tolerated for long, and if it ever succeeded in passing through Parliament it would have to be "repealed by the common indignation and laughter of the English people." In the other speeches that he delivered during the same day the Prime Minister pointed out as a remarkable fact that in proportion as education went on the Conservative cause had progressed in the greater urban centres of the country. Dealing with the question

of allotments, he declared the existence of small owners to be the strongest Conservative anchor which the institutions of the State could have, and said he would hail with great satisfaction any appearance of an inclination on the part of the working classes to attach themselves more closely to the land. But in England small estates rapidly disappeared because they were unprofitable to keep, though in the Channel Islands, in Belgium, and in the south of France they continued to exist and to support their owners. The difficulty might be met in England by the cultivation of fruit, but no plan of small holdings could become general unless it was economically successful. Finally, the Prime Minister dealt with the history of the present Administration, and emphatically denied that it was adventurous, hazardous, or reckless.

The general impression left by the Nottingham Conference was that for the moment at least the Conservatives were strongly opposed to the substitution of Lord Hartington for Lord Salisbury as the leader of the party, and that the Liberal Unionists were indifferent to it. Lord Salisbury, moreover, held, in common with Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, that the time had not come for the complete fusion of the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, and that it would be more wise to await the natural development of the movement than to attempt to force it on by the adoption of a name, which might, in fact, only cover an empty profession. The mutual confidence which had hitherto marked the alliance between the two parties was a better guarantee for joint action in the future than any new flag or party title which would be unrecognisable by the rank and file of the fighters. With regard to the immediate programme of the party, the Conservatives were to content themselves with a few domestic reforms, and to forestall their opponents in granting the inevitable "Free Education" under a form least likely to alienate the clergy and the supporters of voluntary schools. On the other hand, the Conservatives were reassured as to any misgivings they might have had concerning the willingness of their leader to dally with the doctrine of State Socialism. On this question Lord Salisbury took up a very definite position, showing that, for the present at least, the influence of Lord Randolph Churchill upon the Ministerial policy was altogether a thing of the past.

It was to the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) that the ratepayers in large towns naturally looked for carrying into effect the promises of sanitary reform made by his colleagues. In speaking at the Mansion House he had told his hearers that there was no need of new legislation to remove the slums of London and other places if the existing laws were rigidly carried out. There were already six Acts in force, dating from 1855 (Metropolis Management Act), by which the Vestry or District Board was made the local authority to abate nuisances. The majority of these Acts, however, were permissive rather

than compulsory, and, therefore, the Artisans' Dwellings Acts, 1868-85 (Torrens's Acts), the Artisans' Dwellings Improvement Acts, 1875-88 (Cross's Acts), the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1885, and the various Sanitary and Nuisances Removal Acts had generally become inoperative. In a circular addressed to the local authorities Mr. Ritchie called their attention to the powers already in their hands, and hinted that the Government saw little reason for proposing more than a Consolidation Act, in which possibly more stringent powers might be given for setting the law in action.

Mr. Gladstone's reply to the urgent solicitations of his friends to indicate at least the outlines of his Home Rule policy, and the attitude of the Radicals towards the questions of the day, were eagerly looked for. So far as the proceedings of the Manchester Conference, under the presidency of Sir James Kitson, were concerned, they left little to be desired. The reforms to which the party should pledge itself were enthusiastically endorsed by the 1,200 delegates present. The order in which these reforms were to be introduced had been somewhat altered since the previous year's conference, and some slight changes, in accordance with the views of the "Limehouse-cum-Clerkenwell" programme, had to be sanctioned. Briefly summed up, the questions to be pressed for solution were as follows:—

Registration Reforms by the reduction of the qualifying period to three months, making successive occupation universal; and the appointment of responsible registration officers.

Parliamentary Reforms, viz., one man, one vote; returning officers to be paid out of rates; payment of members by the State; all elections on the same day; shorter Parliaments; reform of House of Lords.

Land Law Reforms.—Security for tenants' improvements; enfranchisement of leaseholders; increased powers for obtaining land for allotments; abolition of restrictions on transfer of land; taxation of ground rents and mining royalties.

Social Reforms.—Better housing of the working classes; extension of the Factory Acts; popular control of liquor traffic by localities.

Local Government Reforms.—Establishment of district and parish councils; increased powers to municipal bodies in London and elsewhere.

Taxation Reforms.—Abolition of present duties on tea, coffee, and cocoa; equalisation of death duties on real and personal property; just division of rates between owner and occupier.

Educational Reforms.—Free education in schools under popular representative control; establishment of continuation schools; increased technical and intermediate education.

The Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Established Church in Scotland and Wales, and application of the tithe to purely national purposes.

Mr. Gladstone's utterances were, however, far less distinct or satisfactory to those who did not hear them from his own lips. In his first speech at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester (Dec. 2), he studiously avoided all reference to the Irish question, and contented himself with a general commentary upon the state of public affairs, and the attitude of his party towards the questions under the consideration of the delegates. He began by admitting that there was not much fault to be found with the Government for their management of foreign affairs, but complained that they had for the first time introduced into our administrative system the union of two such important offices as Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary in one man—a practice which substituted to a great and mischievous extent merely individual responsibility for collective judgment and responsibility. Though foreign affairs in the main gave no cause for anxiety or alarm at the present moment, Mr. Gladstone renewed his old complaints against Turkish misrule, urging that it was impossible to be satisfied with what was going on in Crete or in Armenia. He hoped the Government would not gloss over the truth in these matters or use honeyed words in regard to subjects which involved human life, liberty, and property, and, what was still more sacred, the maintenance of female honour. Turning to domestic matters, Mr. Gladstone once more analysed the recent by-elections, and predicted from them the yielding of a large and triumphant Liberal majority at the next general election. The longer the election was delayed, the larger and more victorious that majority would be. He claimed for the Opposition in Parliament that they had endeavoured to make the good measures of the Government better still, and to oppose the bad measures, among which he enumerated the Tithes Bill, the Under-Secretary for Ireland Bill, the Extension of the Ashbourne Act, the Coercion Act, and the Sugar Convention Bill. Among the great subjects for legislation which now needed to be dealt with he pointed to registration, land, and local government. As to registration, he urged that plural voting should be got rid of, and the principle of "one man, one vote," established. Among the shortcomings of the Local Government Acts as they now stood Mr. Gladstone pointed to the fact that the county councils had not been given any powers of taxation, that ground rents had not been assessed, that the care of the police had not been handed over to the councils, that the councils were unable to control the arrangements for the care of the poor or the administration of the liquor laws, and that no provision had yet been made for the establishment of district councils. Mr. Gladstone himself would even go further, and establish a system of parish government. As to land, he complained that the law for providing allotments was inefficient. Among other subjects which required to be dealt with, he briefly indicated the dwellings of the poor, the enfranchisement of leaseholds, the Scotch Crofters, free education,

shorter Parliaments, Disestablishment in Scotland and Wales, Home Rule for Scotland and Wales as well as for Ireland, the currency, and the reform of the House of Lords. But, as he was now in his eightieth year, he admitted that it was not possible for him to have a direct personal interest in many of these questions—he only wished to point out that many of them were ripening, and some were already ripe, and that when Parliament had proceeded in the path of devolution, and especially when it had accomplished the great Irish devolution, it would be able to address itself to the performance of these important tasks.

This speech, however, produced no feeling of disappointment among the majority of Mr. Gladstone's supporters, if we may judge from the opinions expressed by the journals following his leadership; and his silence on Irish affairs was attributed to his intention to devote the whole of his second speech to that subject. This surmise proved to be well founded, for on the following day, in the same place, Mr. Gladstone delivered one of his most brilliant and incisive speeches, accusing the Liberal Unionists of having prevented the Tories from embracing Home Rule. The latter, he thought, were capable of conversion, but the conversion of the Liberal Unionists would be their death. Mr. Gladstone then assured his audience that the serious disintegration of the Liberal party did not begin in 1886. For many of the wealthy and powerful Liberals Home Rule was a perfect godsend, supplying them with a plausible excuse for doing that which in their hearts they had long been seeking for an excuse to do. One good result of their secession had been to shift the centre of gravity in the Liberal party in the direction of Radical opinions. Mr. Gladstone then combated Lord Hartington's statement that the Union had been a tolerable success. Taking the test of the economy of government, he said that the cost of government for each person in Ireland was exactly twice what it was in Great Britain. There was, he urged, an equal disproof in four other tests: the loyalty of the people, their contentment, their wealth, and the reputation which accrues to the country in consequence of the passing of a good law. After repeating his old argument that the Government were responsible for the Plan of Campaign, he urged once more that it was not crime at all against which the Government had been fighting in Ireland. He admitted that in one single case of a bad crime the Act had been instrumental in punishing it; but a Bill was not passed, and 1,500 or 2,000 people imprisoned merely in order to secure the punishment of a single crime. He had been told that nothing could more excite public indignation than the Irish Attorney-General's conduct in the management of the Gweedore trials. But the Attorney-General had been rewarded for his packing juries and for his mode of conducting public business by being appointed Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench. Was it, then, odd that the

Irish had not the same affection as the English for, or the same unlimited confidence in, their Judges? Of course reproaches of this kind did not apply to all the Irish Judges. Mr. Gladstone proceeded to declare that the Mitchelstown affair was not unlike the old Peterloo massacre, near the spot of the present meeting at Manchester, and concluded with a prophecy that the day could not be distant when the triumph of his party would be assured.

Whilst the National Liberal Federation was taking stock of its gains during the year, congratulating itself on its extended action, and Mr. Gladstone was prophesying the approach of the day when it would reap the harvest of its labours, Mr. Balfour was pursuing a triumphal march through the Scotch lowlands—speaking successively at Partick, Glasgow, and Edinburgh—and on each occasion to large and enthusiastic audiences. The first, at Partick, was a speech on the Catholic University question, in which Mr. Balfour pointed out that he had said no more on the last day of that Session than almost all his predecessors and some of his opponents had said before him; but that, apparently, more significance had been attached to it because what he said was on the last day of a Session. The Catholic University question could never be settled without three conditions—that the Irish Catholics should accept what the Government might offer; that the Opposition should not make the solution proposed, whenever it should be proposed, the occasion for a party move against the Government proposing it; and that England, Scotland, and Ireland generally should concur in approving the boon offered to the Irish Catholics. None of these conditions was as yet fulfilled. The Irish leaders had clearly indicated their view that the higher education of their fellow-countrymen was a very small thing in their eyes when compared with the chance of inflicting a political defeat upon the Government; and even in England and Scotland the Unionist party were by no means unanimous in supporting the proposals, some of them objecting to any such scheme on the ground that they objected to sectarian education in general, while a still larger and more important body objected because the sect for whose benefit the proposals were put forward was Roman Catholic. He had been accused of various ulterior motives in the suggestion he made to the House of Commons, but his object had only been to provide the Roman Catholics with a higher education, and he had had no other object whatever in view. The Roman Catholics were about four-fifths of the whole population of Ireland, yet only one in seven of the Irish University students belonged to that faith—in Trinity College only six per cent. of the whole—and throughout Ireland the total number of Roman Catholic University students was less than 250. That was not a creditable state of things, and the Roman Catholic objection to avail themselves of the existing system of higher education was clearly not a passing objection, but was one likely to be permanent. Mr. Balfour went on to say

that he had never been disposed to give the Irish Catholics a degree-giving University confined to Irish Catholics, because he wished the young Irish Catholics to have the opportunity of measuring their attainments and abilities against those of the Protestant bodies; nor would he propose the endowment of theological chairs either for Catholic or Protestant Colleges. But he did think that a Catholic College, whence candidates should be admitted on equal terms with students from Protestant Colleges to some common University, should be endowed with ample resources for teaching in the best way—with a library, with class-rooms, with scientific laboratories, and with the means of paying professors such as would vie with those of Trinity College, Dublin. He wished to assist the great Presbyterian College, Queen's College, Belfast, in the same way; but he could not offer to do that for the Presbyterians without doing it also for the Irish Catholics. He would insist, also, that any College receiving such help should admit students, unprepared to accept the denominational teaching of the Church which held a preponderant influence in that College, on perfectly equal terms. For the present, the solution of the question could not be pressed, as public opinion was not yet ripe for it.

On the following day, at the Glasgow Unionist Club, Mr. Balfour admitted the truth of Sir William Thomson's reproach that English politicians were too impatient in looking for the fruits of a wise and fair policy in Ireland. He declared that in the unquestionable improvement in Ireland we were already reaping some of the fruits of our policy, but that we could not expect a large harvest at once. He held to the view he had always maintained, that one of the most effective methods of extinguishing all that was sham in the cry of Home Rule was to place the occupier of land in a stable and satisfactory condition by making him the owner of the land, not by plundering his landlord. Alluding to the name of the Club, he said their party was one of alliance, and that each section had gained, not politically, but by mutual knowledge of each other. The Liberal wing of the party had shown a great example of patriotism, and the gratitude which the whole country and posterity owed to them was not easy for language to over-estimate.

At Edinburgh Mr. Balfour delivered two speeches—one at a banquet given in his honour and presided over by the Duke of Fife, which was described as one of the grandest of the kind held in the Scotch capital for many years. In responding to the toast of his health, the Chief Secretary protested against Home Rule as a "strange and frantic nightmare of a Constitution consisting of four Parliaments and four Executives." He argued that Home Rule had been tried in Ireland and had failed. It was tried before the great alteration of the Irish Constitution in 1782, when there was one Parliament, which did manage Irish affairs, and was subordinate to another Parliament. In

1782, by one of the few unanimous actions in which the Irish Parliament ever indulged, that Home Rule Parliament was upset, the great Irish patriots of the day holding that a dependent Home Rule Parliament was inconsistent with nationality. A new Constitution was accordingly established, but it lasted less than twenty years. Mr. Balfour then alluded to the teachings of history on the relationship which nationality bore to Home Rule, and pointed to the union of Scotland with England, which from being at first a disliked political union had become a real union of hearts. He contended that if the demand for Home Rule arose from national aspirations Home Rule would not content it; but if it sprang from individual greed or ambition, then, under no circumstances, could they think of giving it. He concluded an extended argument, based on the analogy offered by Scottish history, showing how national sentiment might be used or abused, in these words:—"Difference of locality, difference of race, difference of history, and, I would almost venture to say, under some circumstances, difference of religion, may produce by their results differences of national sentiment which, properly used and properly directed, will be invaluable elements in the body politic. The British Empire gains, I am convinced, instead of loses, by the fact that Scotchmen feel bound to each other. It gains, it does not lose, by the fact that a Scotchman feels himself always a Scotchman, even though he feels himself at the same time to be a British subject. But as you may direct this great feeling of nationality to good ends, so, by stupid perversity, or to obtain some temporary electoral triumph, you may direct it to evil and to pernicious ends; if you are so mad as to direct it in a manner which causes it to crystallise and concentrate round separate legislative institutions, without doubt the whole result must be to cause those separate institutions to diverge further and further apart. Do that, and you convert it from a safe and a health-giving influence—an influence which no wise statesman, no true lover of his country, would desire to see abolished—you convert it into a violent and a disruptive force, which may shatter, if it be ill-guided—which may shatter even the compact fabric of the British Constitution. I have spoken to you as a Scotchman to Scotchmen. I have dwelt at length upon the history of our country and of Ireland, which appears to me to impress itself upon an attentive observer; and I can only conclude by expressing my firm conviction that when our Scotch countrymen begin seriously to reflect upon all that is involved in these crazy crochets of Scotch Home Rule—when they look back upon the prosperous years which have separated them from the time when they first became an integral part of Great Britain—they will reject as a dream of scheming statesmen anything which shall—I will not say shatter, but even weaken in the smallest degree the ties which have so long and so fortunately bound us to our brethren south of the Tweed."

On the following day (Dec. 5) Mr. Balfour addressed in the Waverley Market an audience fully as large as any assembled to hear Mr. Gladstone or Mr. John Morley. His speech was almost entirely a reply to Mr. Gladstone's address to the National Federation at Manchester. He declined to be drawn into fresh controversy about Mitchelstown or the Kinsella case, or to answer Mr. Gladstone's excuses for the Plan of Campaign. He protested, however, against the theory there laid down that the Crimes Act prevented combinations which were legal in Great Britain. The Crimes Act was directed against every species of crime, including criminal combinations, and in this respect it followed the lines of Mr. Gladstone's Coercion Act of 1882, of which the preamble ran :—"Whereas by reason of the extension of secret societies and combinations for illegal purposes the operation of the ordinary law has become insufficient for the repression and prevention of crimes, &c." The Crimes Act of 1886, moreover, contained a provision which was absent from the Act of 1882, inasmuch as the former expressly recognised that anything which was legal under the English Trade Unions Act should remain legal in Ireland, the Crimes Act notwithstanding. Mr. Balfour then hinted that in no single instance had any prisoner's counsel pleaded the operation of this exemption, and further declared that five-sixths of the cases in which the Crimes Act had been put in force had not been cases of conspiracy at all, but of actual crime and violence. Under these circumstances it "was disgraceful" for a man in Mr. Gladstone's position to go about the country and attempt to arouse the working classes by telling them that rights they enjoyed in England and Scotland were denied to their brethren in Ireland. Mr. Balfour then went on to accuse Mr. Gladstone of encouraging crime in Ireland by the "sophistical and absurd excuses" he had invented for the Plan of Campaign; by the "soft epithets" he had found for boycotting; by the attacks he had made on the resident magistracy and the police; and by his treatment of the Gweedore case, in which he charged the Irish Attorney-General with jury-packing, and defended the conduct of Father McFadden in defying and breaking the law. In reply to Mr. Gladstone's attack on the conduct of the trial of those accused of being more or less responsible for the murder of Inspector Martin, Mr. Balfour quoted the testimony of a great English Queen's Counsel, whom he believed to be a Home Ruler, to the admirable fairness with which the judge and jury had performed the difficult duty entrusted to them. Repeating once more his grounds for maintaining that the condition of Ireland had greatly improved, he concluded with a very powerful denunciation of the baits by which Gladstonians are being induced to vote for Home Rule. "If you desire Disestablishment, if you desire Free Education, vote for Home Rule. If you desire to plunder the landlords, vote for Home Rule. If you desire anything, however wild, however

•

foolish, however unprincipled, however opposed it may be to the traditional wisdom of mankind, vote for Home Rule."

Of the sincerity of Mr. Balfour's belief in his own remedies there was little doubt in the minds of his most determined opponents, although they were little disposed to accept his application of them as conclusive. By an accident, fortunate for the Ministerialists, a few days later a case of "boycotting" came to be tried at Salford (Manchester) by an English judge before an English jury. The case was one of a kind common enough in Ireland, the "boycotters" in this case having followed the salesman to Liverpool and endeavoured to prejudice, if not to close against him, the market where dealers purchased Irish beasts. The jury, with only a few minutes' hesitation, found both the accused guilty, and they were promptly sentenced by the judge to imprisonment. It was, perhaps, unfortunate for Mr. John Morley, whose convictions were as deep and undoubted as Mr. Balfour's, that this trial had not taken place before he set out on his campaign to recall Scotchmen to their allegiance to the Liberal cause. No better champion could be found in the Liberal ranks, and by common consent Mr. Morley acquitted himself valiantly. Commencing, like Mr. Balfour, with Glasgow (Dec. 6), he reminded his hearers that, although the Chief Secretary had "shown plenty of mettle," there was "nothing more dangerous than mettle in a blind horse." In reply to the charge that he had pilfered some of the social reforms of the Tory party, Mr. Morley retorted that if it were so he must have been like the thief in Fielding's "Jonathan Wild," who was by force of habit such an inveterate thief that he could not help putting his hand into a pocket which he knew to be empty, and could not refrain from cheating at cards, though he knew that even if he won he should never get paid. He contended, in opposition to Mr. Balfour, that the Act of Union had failed, and that its failure was conspicuously established by the fact that the present Government had had to pass a Coercion Act for Ireland which was to endure for ever. He strongly censured the Chief Secretary's "singular gracelessness" in the attack he had made upon Mr. Gladstone, and indignantly denied the accusation that Mr. Gladstone had encouraged crime. In the case of Father M^cFadden, the persons who were morally responsible for the murder of Inspector Martin were the authorities who sent an insufficient force to arrest a priest in the midst of his flock when he had just finished the performance of divine service. The Irish Attorney-General did indulge in jury-packing, as he ordered forty-two persons to stand aside simply because they were Roman Catholics. Mr. Morley went on to contend that combinations which were legal in this country were illegal in Ireland under the Crimes Act, the only difference being that the combinations which were legal in the one country were between employers and employed,

while those which were illegal in the other were between landlord and tenant. Mr. Balfour on this point had only endeavoured to throw dust in the eyes of the people. Mr. Morley next accused Mr. Balfour of dropping his Irish University scheme because his Orange friends would not let him go on with it; and finally Mr. Morley asked what the Tories were going to do if the Special Commission reported against the Irish members. Would they continue to endure their companionship in Parliament, or would they expel them? In either case the Unionist party were in a most unfavourable strait.

The most instructive point of Mr. Morley's speech was that which raised the whole question of the future government of Ireland, and furnished Sir Henry James, speaking a night or two later (Dec. 9) at Newcastle-under-Lyme, with the materials of his counter-view of the case. Mr. Morley, in remarking on what Mr. Balfour had said at Partick on the question of a Catholic University, pointed out with good effect that in that speech a powerful Minister of the Unionist party confessed frankly that he could not do what he thought the good of Ireland required, on account of the difficulties thrown in his way by the Ulster Orangemen, and the general opinion of English and Scotch electorates, which was confessedly unfavourable to the concession of even the most just and indispensable Catholic claims. What better argument, said Mr. Morley, could be found for Home Rule than such a confession that a Government is prevented by the prejudices of England, Scotland, and part of Ireland, from doing what it deems necessary for the welfare of Ireland? Sir Henry James, without making any explicit reference to Mr. Morley's remark on this point, rallied Mr. Morley and his colleagues on maintaining in the same breath that the opinion of Great Britain and Ireland was driving us rapidly into Home Rule, and yet that the public opinion of this country was so reluctant to do justice to Ireland that the concession of Irish Home Rule was necessary in order to protect Ireland against the prejudice and prepossessions of Great Britain. If, he said, the people of Great Britain were already converted by Mr. Gladstone to the radical injustice of our Irish policy, Irishmen were at least secured against any deliberate repetition of the injustice complained of. It was hardly decent to exclaim at the same moment that nothing but Home Rule could save Ireland from oppression, and that the British people were so determined to put down oppression that they would at the next General Election hand Ireland over to an Irish Legislature and an Irish Administration.

Passing from the west to the east of Scotland, Mr. Morley addressed a large meeting at Dundee (Dec. 9), but on this occasion he left the Irish question altogether, and discussed the other points of the Radical programme and the social changes which he anticipated or desired in the near future. He declared

that in Great Britain "the drones had garrisoned the workers," and he foresaw that "enormous changes" would have to take place before long. He urged the reform of the House of Lords, and especially that peers should be permitted to exercise an option as to whether they would sit in the Upper Chamber or not, and if they elected not to sit there they should be eligible for election to the House of Commons—a change which he thought would secure the presence of Lord Rosebery and Lord Aberdeen, among others, in the Lower Chamber. He also suggested "the removal of the hand of the State from religion and the disestablishment of the Church." It would be impossible when a Liberal majority came into power to maintain a Scottish establishment. Mr. Morley went on to sneer at Lord Salisbury's views on wages, the relations of employer and employed, and the importance of emigration as a remedy for over-population, and then argued in favour of sweeping land-law reforms, including among other things the abolition of the power of landlords who had land in the vicinity of towns to "throttle" those towns. The municipalities should have compulsory powers for the acquisition of land within a certain area around them. Mr. Morley also urged that free access should be given to every unenclosed moor and mountain, that "sport must take its chance," that better houses and more amusement should be provided for the people, and that "social justice" should be granted, and "equality be given a chance."

The duel which had been going on throughout the recess might well have been allowed to cease at this point, for it seemed as if all that could be said on the questions which divided the antagonists had been long since exhausted. The year, however, was not to close without a final utterance on each side. On behalf of the Unionists, their most distinguished and trusted leader, Lord Hartington, at Bacup, summed up (Dec. 14) the position he and his friends aimed at occupying in the political strife. He denied the accuracy of Mr. Gladstone's contention that the only reason for the existence of the Liberal Unionist party was their opposition to Ireland, and that their conversion to Home Rule would mean their political extinction. It might just as well be said of the Volunteers or of the Militia that the only reason for their existence was the possibility of an invasion of our country by a foreign Power. The Liberal Unionists had, no doubt, been called out for a special purpose, to resist a special danger, or rather they had not been called out, but had remained at a post which others had deserted, and they had found in the Conservative party the best allies they could find in support of the position they had taken up. It was no reproach to them that they had taken the best means they could to maintain the Conservative party, and to support that position. He denied that the Liberal Unionists had assisted the Conservative Government to defeat Liberal principles, though he admitted that they had helped the

Government to avoid defeat when embarrassing amendments which the Government could not accept were moved to Government measures. To accuse them of being no longer Liberals because they had acted thus was "trifling and childish." In reply to Mr. Gladstone's declaration that the Liberal Opposition had given "unquestioning aid" to the Government in passing its Local Government Acts, Lord Hartington reminded his hearers that the Opposition spent six nights in debating the second reading of the English Act and four-and-twenty nights in committee upon it in trying to remove every safeguard and to introduce amendments which the Government could not accept. But for the assistance which the Liberal Unionists gave to the Government, these measures, of which Mr. Gladstone strongly approved, would have been "supported" out of existence by the party who now claimed half the credit of them. As to Mr. Gladstone's view that poor Ireland had been "robbed and cruelly plundered" by rich England, that was a strange argument to come from one who, for a longer period than any other, had been responsible for the financial arrangements between the two countries. If the Irish had any grievance arising out of taxation, nobody was more responsible than Mr. Gladstone himself, and eight years ago Mr. Gladstone contended, and gave statistics to prove, that no population in all Europe had made such progress as the Irish population. To-day, certainly, the state of Ireland was in every respect better than it was in 1881, when Mr. Gladstone made that declaration. Lord Hartington then went on to repeat his often expressed demand for some explanation of what Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy now was, and then he commented on the new Liberal programme, which he described as being "not for practical purposes, but intended merely to catch votes." He promised, however, that no policy for the improvement of the condition of the people would be resisted by the Liberal Unionists merely because some parts of it might be described as "socialistic," but he re-echoed Mr. John Morley's recent warning to the people that, after all, when the State had done all it could, there was much that must be done by the people themselves, who would have to depend largely upon self-reliance and their own exertions. Lord Hartington objected to the principle of "one man, one vote," but approved of some improvement being made in registration. He would like to see the licensing powers in the hands of the local authorities, but some just system of compensation to those who were deprived of their property ought to be established, and, though he did not oppose the taxation of ground-rents, he objected to such a scheme being inequitably carried out. But the Unionist party would not shrink from facing any of these questions on principles of justice and equality between class and class, and the removal of all privilege possessed by one class against another.

It was only fitting that the last word in the political contro-

versy which had raged round the Irish question should be left to Mr. Parnell. A rare and always a weighty speaker, his utterance was the more welcomed as both sides hoped to find in it some clue to the future policy of the party with which he had allied himself. But in speaking to English audiences Mr. Parnell had already on more than one occasion painted his aims and wants in such soft and moderate colours that the reality of the picture had been called in question. At Nottingham (Dec. 16), and at Liverpool (Dec. 18), his speeches were characterised by such exaggerated moderation that it was difficult for the public to harmonise with them the utterances of his lieutenants when addressing Irish audiences. The Nottingham meeting, which had been carefully arranged some time in advance, was noteworthy inasmuch as Mr. Parnell was for the first time officially recognised by the Liberal party, Mr. Arnold Morley, the Liberal whip, taking a formal part in the proceedings, whilst at the meeting at Liverpool Mr. Parnell arrived direct from Hawarden Castle, where he had been the guest of the Liberal leader. These surroundings gave to Mr. Parnell's speeches more importance than their tone or matter would otherwise have attracted; for, although the former was studiously moderate, the latter was marred by certain errors of fact, which discredited the arguments founded thereon. In the first of the two speeches delivered at Nottingham, in reply to the chairman's remarks, Mr. Parnell said he thought the report of the Special Commission would not be to the discredit of the Irish members or to the discredit of the movement with which they have been connected. There had been, in every agrarian movement, from the days of Rome until now, "accompaniments of a deplorable, and in many cases of a criminal, character. When the minds of great masses of the people, who have been kept in a condition bordering upon slavery, are agitating for the first time, when for the first time some hope of ameliorating their condition begins to dawn upon them, there is always a danger that the younger and the more rash among the community will be led into the adoption of methods and actions which all right-thinking persons must inevitably condemn, and I have always been willing to admit that the Irish agrarian movement has not been free from such deplorable occurrences." Yet he claimed that never had an agrarian movement of such importance to a country been carried out which had so taken hold of the minds and imaginations of the people, which had been attended with so little crime, or achieved such great success with so little suffering so far as regarded the people concerned and engaged in it. With regard to the broader movement for Home Rule, he said that it had been thought that an Irish Parliament would attempt to obtain separation from England and to disintegrate the empire. So far as he had had anything in his thoughts as to what they would be doing, he had looked to the industrial development of Ireland. He did not think the best way to promote the nation-

ality of Ireland was by making war upon England or by raising armaments, even if they could do so; but by constructing harbours, clearing out rivers, reclaiming waste lands, developing mineral resources, and restoring manufacturing industries. Irishmen felt that they were better adapted for doing this by knowledge and intention than Mr. Balfour, who was about to lay out British money in making railways in the impoverished districts of the west of Ireland instead of on some well-considered scheme that would give a probable return. The past expenditure on public works in Ireland had generally been attended with scandalous waste and had proved to be practically useless. For his own part, he looked rather to local and individual effort than to State-aided industries to improve the condition of the country.

Speaking in the evening to a large meeting, Mr. Parnell said in reply to the address of welcome presented to him that their expressions of sympathy with Ireland would do more to keep the Irish people within the paths of the Constitution and the rash ones among them from the perpetration of crime than all the twenty years of coercion that Lord Salisbury promised. To ensure success, Lord Salisbury ought to have given more coercion or none at all; the mixture of government under the Constitution and by coercion would never succeed. Mr. Balfour's first mistake had been when he refused in the autumn of 1886 to make provision for the distressed condition of Irish tenants according to Mr. Parnell's Bill. The second was when, after being forced to bring forward such a Bill the following year, he left out provision for arrears and for restoration of evicted tenants. "I was most anxious personally that the land question in Ireland should not be exacerbated; I was most anxious that the tenants should not be combined into a resisting force. I know the dangers of such a movement, but I have every hope that those dangers will not accompany the present movement. I was anxious to rely on the Legislature and the professions of the Tory party at the hustings in 1886 that they intended to legislate justly for Ireland from Westminster. . . . The Irish tenants, many of them, have admitted what have been the benefits of the Act of 1887, but have declined to abandon the men who had helped to win that Act for them. Justly so. As in this country one set of men will stand up for another set of working men without having any grievance of their own, so in Ireland tenants will stand up for their weaker brethren and insist that if injustice is done to one it is injustice done to all. And so, for want of a halfpennyworth of tar, Lord Salisbury has lost his ship. My reluctance to promote the formation of another great agrarian agitation or movement was of necessity overcome. I could not see the men upon these estates throughout Ireland left to be ground between the landlords, the emergency men, and the Government. It was pure vengeance, and nothing else, that prevented these men from having the same rights as the rest of the tenantry of the country;

it was pure vindictiveness." Mr. Balfour would not be able to defeat the Tenants' Defence League. It was true that, owing to the sacrifices of Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party, Ireland was tranquil and free from crime. But she was not appeased. She did not submit to the Government. On the contrary, the disposition of the people against the Government had been intensified tenfold during the last three years. "To anyone who has studied the sad history of Ireland, and who knows that only ten short years ago the great masses of the people of Ireland trusted very little to any constitutional action, it is a great consolation to reflect that he and you will hereafter be able to say, 'We helped to win Ireland to the Constitution; we had our share in inducing her to confine her attempts for her own amelioration solely to peaceful means; we took a part in this great work.'" Mr. Parnell went on to say that his party would help the Liberal party in this country in dealing with questions of the working classes. He hoped that the relations between employers and employed would be settled in this country without injury to either side, and that Mr. Gladstone, "the greatest statesman of this age," might be spared to solve the question. "We should like humbly to follow in your footsteps, and when you have given us power over our own business at home, we should like, instead of plotting against the integrity of this great empire, instead of seeking to levy war against the Queen—instead of striving for the separation of the two countries—we should like to do some little thing, and there is more to be done than perhaps many people in this country think—to give employment to our people at home, to develop the struggling industries of our country, to teach our agricultural classes how to farm their land, to teach our people how to work and to take advantage of those industrial and mineral resources which Ireland to some extent possesses, to look after the arterial drainage of the country, to improve our harbours, to develop our lines of inland navigation, to promote the prosperity of languishing fisheries, to do all those things mostly by those means which only a native legislature can do which is intimately acquainted with the wants of the people of the country." After ridiculing the notion of the Ulster men fighting against subjection to a Parliament at Dublin, Mr. Parnell made some references to Grattan's Parliament, which he said he was urged to ask for, because there was historical precedent for it. But he had no hesitation in saying there was danger of friction in that Parliament, which was absent from the scheme of 1886. Grattan's Parliament and Constitution gave the Irish power of separate action in Imperial matters, a most dangerous power, and a power which was abused in those days. The Ministers also were appointed by the Crown, and held office at its pleasure; in other words, the constitutional theory was carried out in full integrity and strictness, instead of being, as in England, subject to Parliamentary control.

Mr. Arnold Morley then moved a resolution congratulating Mr. Parnell "on the vindication of his character from the foul libels and aspersions of the *Times*." In acknowledging its adoption by the meeting, Mr. Parnell briefly remarked that he would rather have died under the suspicion of having written the letters than have accepted the vindication offered him by the Government. For under pretence of this vindication they had turned from the personal charges to charges against his movement and against his country. In reality, the Government fought them from behind the *Times*, and the next Special Commission would be to try the reality of the connection between the present First Lord of the Treasury and "his old friend Walter."

After spending a day and a night at Hawarden Castle, in fulfilment of a long-standing engagement, Mr. Parnell went on to Liverpool, where he was presented with a cheque for 3,500*l.* towards the Parnell Defence Fund. In acknowledging the gift Mr. Parnell declared that he was the first Irishman who had ever been so trusted by Englishmen, for they had trusted him before Sir Charles Russell had won the victory for him before the Commission. In speaking of the Commission he again, as at Nottingham, momentarily laid aside his conciliatory tones. "We had a tribunal carefully chosen by our enemies from the ranks of our political opponents, a tribunal which would not be wilfully unfair, I grant you, but who from the necessity of the case were bound to be prejudiced. Every step was taken, every plan was laid by the Government and their co-conspirators to prevent us—my colleagues and myself—from removing that cloud from our reputation."

Mr. Parnell went on to contend that the development of Ireland's nationality—the construction of Ireland as a nation—depended upon Ireland's industrial recuperation. The Irish did not mean to wage war upon England—they would be very great fools if they did. All they wanted was to be allowed to attend to their own business, to teach their people how to work, what to work at, and where to work, and to set up a feeble imitation of England's great manufacturing and industrial prosperity. Turning next to the Plan of Campaign, he maintained that those who set it in motion had prevented eviction and saved the Irish tenants from extermination, that they had kept their movement absolutely free from crime, and that their success had been extraordinary. On none of the Plan of Campaign estates had there been an outrage to property, person, or life. The working of the movement had been absolutely crimeless. He denied the contention of the Conservative party that Mr. Balfour had only done that which the Liberal party themselves had done before. Lord Spencer's coercion was directed against actual crime and great secret conspiracies; it was not directed against shopkeepers for refusing to sell goods, and was not directed

against persons for advising tenants to stand by their combination, and not to allow their weaker brethren to go to the wall. Mr. Balfour, when he went to Ireland, found Ireland crimeless ; he found her free from combination ; he found no strife between tenants and landlords. What had come of his rule was to be seen on the Ponsonby estate, where Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants having combined against him, the town of Tipperary was being desolated, shopkeepers evicted, and their goods thrown into the street. After a long defence of the Plan of Campaign, from which Mr. Parnell had previously withheld his approval, he declared that, although the Irish people considered that a peasant proprietary was likely to be the most successful system for Ireland, they would not consent to inaugurate rates by means of sales effected under coercion. In conclusion Mr. Parnell denied that Irishmen, if well treated, were disloyal, or that they would oppress their Protestant fellow-countrymen. If Home Rule were granted to Ireland, he predicted that Irishmen would avoid every inducement to riot or rebellion ; for now that the great Liberal party had come to the help and rescue of Ireland it would be madness for Irishmen, with the prospect before them of all legitimate freedom, and with every power to do all that was necessary for their own success and the prosperity of their nation in the future—it would be madness for them to talk about physical force.

Nothing, apparently, could be more moderate than Mr. Parnell's demands ; and doubtless, if the Unionists could have persuaded themselves that nothing more was required to make Ireland prosperous and contented, few would have wished to frustrate his aspirations. But Mr. Parnell's speech waked no echo in his own country, and, although his party organs endorsed his utterances, they displayed no warm enthusiasm in so doing.

The year's course was now well-nigh run, and nothing beyond the progress of the quarrel with Portugal marked its closing days. In this matter, of which the solution stood over for the next year, it was obvious from the beginning of the negotiations that the Lisbon Government would not or could not restrain its representatives in Eastern Africa. In the former case the pleadings and evasions of the Portuguese Ministry were merely dilatory, and were raised in the hope that Lord Salisbury would be satisfied with verbal promises ; in the latter alternative Portugal had but little cause to complain if England took steps to render effective the promises which the Lisbon Government was unable to carry out. In the first instance Lord Salisbury displayed forbearance and courtesy, as due from a stronger to a weaker Power ; but when he found that his course was misinterpreted, he gave orders to the various ships on the South African station to rendezvous in the neighbourhood of the Portuguese ports, whilst an imposing array of ironclads was assembled at Gibraltar, and others detached to strike simultaneously the other

colonial possessions of Portugal. Such was the state of international relations with that Power when the year closed. No other cloud rested upon the horizon of foreign politics, and even the long-standing difficulties with the United States, the conclusion of an Extradition Treaty, and the settlement of fishing rights in Behring Straits were in the way to settlement; whilst Canada, acting under pressure or advice, had prolonged for another year the *modus vivendi* temporarily arrived at regarding the more important fisheries on the east coast.

In home politics the settlement of the Irish question still occupied the foremost place in the minds of politicians; and as has been seen the leaders of parties or sections had been busy throughout the year in expounding their respective solutions. Although Mr. Gladstone had steadily refused to explain the details of his new Home Rule scheme, or to meet the criticisms which were passed upon his old one, yet enough was said by him and his lieutenants to show that his policy would aim at the creation of a statutory Parliament and Executive for the control, subject to certain exceptions, of the domestic affairs of Ireland. The representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament had, after some hesitation, been distinctly conceded by Mr. Gladstone, and presumably had been accepted even by those, like Mr. John Morley, who had regarded the exclusion of Irish members as necessary for the regular working of the Parliament at Westminster. This solution, to the minds of certain Home Rulers, logically involved, if it did not actually point to, the creation of separate parliaments for England, Scotland and Wales—in a word to Federation—reserving for some specially constituted body the discussion of such questions as would be termed Imperial. It was contended that the measure of Home Rule for Ireland must be the measure of Home Rule for the other parts of the United Kingdom, otherwise Irish members would have larger powers over British affairs than British members would have over those of Ireland. Behind these came another body of Home Rulers, who, shrinking from the federal system, proposed to create for England, Scotland, and Wales, not separate parliaments, but county or provincial assemblies, on which should devolve a large measure of the local and private Bill legislation now performed by Parliament.

On the side of the Unionists two policies of solution were put forward—one by Lord Salisbury, supported by Lord Hartington and the bulk of the Conservatives and Unionists, and the other by Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Randolph Churchill, some members of the Government, and many of the Conservative rank and file. Lord Salisbury's policy was the strict maintenance of the *status quo*, modified after a fuller settlement of the agrarian question by an extension of the Local Government Bill to Ireland, involving nothing more than local government on a municipal model. Meanwhile, however, the Irish were to give assurances that they

had abandoned all idea of a separate legislature. This attitude was naturally based on the assumption that any concession of local autonomy was a step towards separation, to which they held themselves bound to make an uncompromising opposition.

Midway between these two extremes lay the proposals of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord R. Churchill, and their followers, who recognised the prudence if not the necessity of conceding some form of local self-government with or without legislative powers. They would found throughout Ireland provincial authorities or councils, with which the Imperial Parliament was to have concurrent power of making laws—apparently including the levying of taxes—thus in contradistinction with Mr. Gladstone's scheme, and leading to constant struggles between the provincial legislatures and the Imperial Parliament.

This division of opinion affected to an appreciable extent the position of parties at the close of the year. The Gladstonian Liberals had undoubtedly gained several seats at the by-elections, but it remained an open question whether they had gained any equivalent strength, either in the House of Commons or in the country. On the other hand, notwithstanding Mr. Goschen's successful finance, the unquestionable approval of the naval policy of the Ministry, and the soundness of Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, it could not be said that the Conservatives were stronger or better prepared for a fresh trial of strength at the polls. It was a curious fact that neither party seemed to have profited by the depreciation of the other; both Liberals and Conservatives seemed weaker in their hold upon the public mind, whilst no third party had arisen to take advantage of the situation. 'The general tone of contentment and prosperity which had characterised the year, the lifting of the war clouds which had settled on the Eastern horizon, and a greater recognition of the duties of capital to labour might in some measure account for this political lassitude; but a still greater source was the transition through which party government was passing. The year had seen the shifting of the centre of gravity in both great parties. On the Liberal side the Radicals were imposing their views and aspirations upon the Liberals of all colours who followed Mr. Gladstone's leadership; whilst the Unionists had imposed upon the Conservatives as the price of their alliance the adoption of a policy which could scarcely be distinguished from that of the Liberals prior to 1885. In both Houses the Conservatives supported measures which a few years previously they would have condemned as almost revolutionary; whilst the Liberals demanded remedies which they would formerly have denounced as socialistic. The rise of the new Radicals, with Mr. Labouchere as their leader, seemed to point rather to the disintegration of the Liberal party than to its speedy return to power; but on the other hand the apparent inability of the Liberal Unionists to maintain their hold upon the electorate showed of

what unreliable materials the Ministerial majority was composed. In a word, government by groups was apparently replacing government by party, and the danger apprehended by statesmen was that in the course of time no party leader would be able to count upon the support of any group after or until its particular demands had been satisfied.

CHAPTER VI.

SCOTLAND AND IRELAND.

I. SCOTLAND.

THE year in Scotland was marked by no very important events, and if the cause of Home Rule for that country made any advance it was fair to infer from the successive campaigns of the Liberal leaders north of the Tweed to rally the Scotch voters that they did not anticipate any early repeal of the Act of Union. In the five by-elections, however, which took place during the year, the strong influence of Mr. Gladstone showed no signs of being lessened. On the contrary in each contest the Gladstonian majority was more marked than at either of the elections of 1885 and 1886. These elections as well as the visits of the leaders of all parties have been referred to elsewhere. Although the Unionists and Conservatives met with friendly and in some cases enthusiastic reception, no evidence of the permanent results of their exhortations was to be found in the ballot boxes. In Parliament, as has been seen, Scottish legislation had occupied a conspicuous place. The Scottish Local Government Bill included amongst other important reforms the application of 246,000*l.* per annum, derived from probate and licence duties, to the relief of fees in public elementary schools, making education free in Scotland, up to and including the fifth standard. A great share of the credit for this boon was due to Professor Hunter, one of the members for Aberdeen, though his proposal to limit the relief to Board schools only was not accepted by the House, which extended it to denominational schools also. Before the close of the year, out of a total of 3,128 schools, relief had been granted to infants and up to Standard V. in 2,261 schools, whilst in view of the poverty of certain districts the relief in 100 more schools was extended up to Standard VI., and in 668 others to all the scholars in attendance.

The crofters in the highlands and islands were comparatively quiet during the year. There were no serious outbreaks or riots in defiance of the law, although there were two or three cases of fence-breaking, and at least one of deforcement of sheriff's officers in the Lewis. The Crofters' Commissioners continued their inquiries in Skye and Lewis, where rents were reduced by amounts varying from 21 to 37 per cent., and arrears were cancelled to an extent ranging from 60 to 75 per cent. As the result of their

three years' work, the Commissioners reduced rents by 12,000*l.*, and cancelled 51,000*l.* of arrears. During the latter part of the year the Commissioners were engaged in Shetland and in Caithness. Their decisions in Shetland were received with general disfavour, and in some cases gave rise to considerable discontent; whilst in Sutherland the removal of the restrictions placed on the crofters' tenure led to an increase in smuggling and illicit distillation. Meanwhile remedial measures for developing the resources of the highlands and islands were pressed upon the attention of the Government. In April Mr. Caldwell, one of the members for Glasgow, made an unofficial tour in Lewis, the results of which were embodied in an exhaustive report addressed to the Scottish Secretary. Mr. Caldwell's report dealt with the causes of poverty in the highlands and islands, and with the proposed remedies, which included the construction of piers and harbours at suitable points, of tramroads in the islands of Lewis and Skye, and of a branch line of railway from some convenient point on the west coast of the mainland to the existing railway system, in order to bring the produce of the fishing and other industries within reach of the southern markets. This inquiry was followed in June by an official visit to the Hebrides and Western Highlands by Lord Lothian, in his capacity of Scottish Secretary. This visit was understood to result in proposals submitted to the Cabinet, similar to those previously made by Mr. Caldwell. In the House of Commons in August the Lord Advocate expressed the hope that early in the following Session he would be able to lay before Parliament a scheme of improvements founded on Lord Lothian's report, and Mr. W. H. Smith, speaking at Glasgow in November, intimated that the Government had resolved to appoint a small commission of practical men to examine on the spot the proposals which had been laid before the Government for the development of the fishing industry, for the improvement of harbours, and for the construction of light railways similar to those in certain parts of Ireland. This commission was appointed before the close of the year. The new Government scheme of emigration, inaugurated in 1888, having proved successful, a second batch of emigrants from Lewis and Harris was despatched this year in April. The contingent, consisting of 50 families, and numbering in all 260 souls, sailed from Glasgow in April, their destination being the township of Wolseley, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Amongst the more domestic events of the year may be cited the further proofs given by Scotchmen of their love of their capital and their readiness to embellish it. Foremost among such was the inauguration of the National Portrait Gallery in Edinburgh, when it was announced that the munificent donor of the handsome building, whose name had not been previously disclosed, was Mr. John Ritchie Findlay, of Aberlour, the chief proprietor of the *Scotsman*, who had expended 50,000*l.* on the

institution. Good progress was made during the year with a similarly patriotic work, the restoration of the old Parliament Hall in Edinburgh Castle, due to the munificence of the late William Nelson, publisher. The exterior of the building was finished, and the whole was expected to be completed early in the following year. Rapid progress was also made with the building of the great hall of the University of Edinburgh, the gift of Mr. William M'Ewan, one of the members for the City.

II. IRELAND.

The opening of the year 1889 found Ireland steadily progressing under the administration of a firm and resolute Government, though still constantly agitated by the speeches of Mr. Parnell's parliamentary followers. Early in January Messrs. Finucane, Sheehy, Edward Harrington, Cox, John O'Connor, William O'Brien, and Dr. Tanner were prosecuted in different parts of Ireland for offences committed under the Crimes Act. They were found guilty and sentenced to various short terms of imprisonment. At Naas (Jan. 9) a meeting of 150 delegates of the National League was held, at which Mr. William O'Brien was present, and made a violent speech, for which he was afterwards summoned at the sessions of Carrick-on-Suir. Whilst the case was pending before the magistrates Mr. O'Brien fled from the court, and a warrant was issued for his arrest. He drove from Carrick to Wexford (a distance of ninety miles) in an open trap, got on board a collier, landed at Bridgend, went to London, and from thence to Manchester. At Manchester he attended a meeting of Mr. Jacob Bright's supporters at the Hulme Town Hall, made an impassioned harangue, and then surrendered himself to the police, who held a warrant for his arrest. He was afterwards taken back to Ireland, and committed to Clonmel Gaol to undergo the term of four months' imprisonment to which he had been sentenced. Mr. Edward Harrington, who had been convicted under the Crimes Act for the publication in the *Kerry Sentinel* of a speech said to have been delivered at a meeting of one of the branches of the National League, was unsuccessful on an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench against the conviction. During the month of January evictions were commenced on the estate of Mr. Olphert at Falcarragh. At Kiltrush Captain Vandeleur at first rejected the propositions for a settlement of the disputes between him and his tenants, but ultimately agreed that they should be referred to the arbitration of Sir Charles Russell, M.P., by whom an award was made in the month of May, granting the tenants an abatement of about 20 per cent. upon their present rents.

In the month of February a considerable amount of agitation was got up amongst the Parnellite party on the subject of the treatment of Mr. O'Brien in Clonmel Gaol. On inquiry, how

ever, it turned out that Mr. O'Brien had refused to put on the clothes which had been provided for him by the prison authorities, and in other respects had failed to comply with the prison regulations. Mr. O'Brien was subsequently removed to Tralee Gaol. At Tralee Mr. O'Brien was brought up before the magistrates on a charge of conspiracy under the Crimes Act. During the proceedings Mr. T. Healy, M.P., who appeared as counsel for the accused, called Colonel Turner, the resident magistrate, a sneak, and as he refused to withdraw the expression, he was turned out of court by order of the magistrates. Mr. O'Brien was afterwards found guilty, and, on his refusal not to take any future part in the Plan of Campaign, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment without hard labour. On appeal this sentence was reduced, so that the term of imprisonment should expire simultaneously with the term to which he had been sentenced at Carrick-on-Suir. Early in February the Liberal Unionists of Ireland gave a dinner to Mr. Balfour in Dublin. Letters from Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were read eulogising the services which the Chief Secretary was rendering to Ireland. Replying to the toast of his health, Mr. Balfour pointed out the absurdity of the charge that Ireland was being governed by martial law, and said that its growing prosperity was a proof of the confidence that had been restored by the impartial administration of the law. Referring to the histrionic performance of Mr. W. O'Brien in gaol, he ridiculed the fuss made by a man who was only asked to do what every other prisoner was subject to who offended against the laws. Instructions, however, he said, had been given that no eccentricity of Mr. O'Brien was to be allowed to risk injury to his constitution.

On Sunday (Feb. 8) District-Inspector Martin, of the Irish Constabulary, was murdered at Gweedore in attempting to arrest Father McFadden under a warrant. Father McFadden was leaving his chapel after mass when the police tried to arrest him. He ran towards the house followed by the police, at whom stones were thrown. One of them struck Martin on the head. He fell senseless, and died a few hours afterwards. Father McFadden was arrested and sent to Derry Gaol. Father McFadden and nineteen other persons were subsequently charged with the murder.

On February 26 Dr. Maguire, the well-known professor of Trinity College, Dublin, died in London, where he had been summoned to give evidence on the Special Commission. A curious incident, illustrative of the state of feeling in Ireland, took place in the Roman Catholic church at Clonmel on March 3. The Roman Catholic soldiers of the garrison were in the habit of attending mass there every Sunday morning. Whilst the officiating priest, Father Byrne, was reading the Bishop's Lenten pastoral, in which he strongly condemned the action of the Government towards Ireland, and adjured the people to pray for

their country in the time of trouble, Lieutenant Geohegan, who was in charge of the troops, rose in his seat and ordered his men to leave the building. As they did not immediately obey, he repeated the order twice. Father Byrne, addressing the men from the altar, commanded them to remain in their seats, and all the soldiers, except two sergeants who followed Lieutenant Geohegan out of church, obeyed the priest and stayed where they were until mass was over. On leaving the church Lieutenant Geohegan was hooted and hustled by a crowd of people, and when the soldiers marched to their barracks they were accompanied by a crowd who cheered them for the course they had adopted. Before Lieutenant Geohegan left the church, Father Byrne publicly rebuked him, and said he should report his conduct to his superior officer. Lieutenant Geohegan was subsequently charged before the magistrates with brawling, and sentenced by a majority of the Bench to pay a fine of 3*l*. Notwithstanding the daily decrease of lawlessness in the country, there were yet parts of Ireland where it was extremely difficult to procure evidence for the Crown in consequence of the great risks run by the witnesses. In the course of a trial of some Moonlighters before Baron Dowse at Limerick (March 25) he observed to a witness for the prosecution who said that she was afraid of her life that "he was surprised that anyone gave evidence at all for the Crown, or that anyone lived in Kerry or Limerick if he could live elsewhere." In the same case, when summing up to the jury, the learned Baron further remarked that "he wondered how any people could come forward to give evidence for the Crown." In the course of the spring Mr. Conybeare, M.P., who had come over to Ireland for the purpose of studying the eviction question on the Olphert estate at Falcarragh, co. Donegal, was charged with the offences of conspiracy and incitement under the Crimes Act. The offences were proved against him, and he was sentenced to three months' imprisonment as a first-class misdemeanant. During the summer a syndicate of landlords, at the head of which was Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P., had been formed for the purpose of combating the Plan of Campaign on the Ponsonby estate. This retaliatory measure, as it was considered, especially roused the ire of Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., who delivered at Clonakilty, co. Cork (June 3), a violent speech against Mr. Smith-Barry. Mr. O'Brien was afterwards sentenced to two months' imprisonment as a first-class misdemeanant for taking part in a conspiracy to induce the tenants on the Smith-Barry estate to abstain from paying their rents. The chief topic of interest during the late summer and early autumn was the development of the conflict between Mr. Smith-Barry and his tenants.

At the end of August the Viceroyalty became vacant by the retirement of the Marquess of Londonderry. He was succeeded by the Earl of Zetland. One of the latest acts of the Session of

1889 was the passing of the Irish Light Railways Bill—a measure which, it was hoped, would prove of considerable benefit to the country. The spirit in which it was received by the Nationalist press may be judged from a quotation from *United Ireland*, which said—“This disreputable little Bill is a beggarly restitution out of a vast plunder.” *Freeman's Journal* was of opinion that it was “meant to be a bribe, and the Irish members who voted for it were quite justified in so doing.” Mr. M. Davitt, on the other hand, dropping political considerations, wrote to *Freeman's Journal* saying “that the measure, if honestly and judiciously applied to certain parts of the country, will do good admits of no denial.”

On Oct. 17 the trial of the Gweedore prisoners commenced before Mr. Justice Gibson at Maryborough. Ten prisoners were indicted for the murder of District-Inspector Martin on Feb. 3, while Father McFadden and twelve others were indicted for conspiring to impede and obstruct the execution of certain lawful warrants. Six of the prisoners, on the advice of their counsel, pleaded guilty to the offence of manslaughter, and eight others pleaded guilty to a misdemeanour, whilst Father McFadden pleaded guilty to obstructing the police. Sentences ranging from seven years' penal servitude to two months' imprisonment with hard labour were passed upon these fourteen, whilst Father McFadden was bound over in his own recognisances to come up for judgment if called upon. Of the other persons indicted William Coll was found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude, whilst in the case of John Gallagher the jury were discharged without agreeing.

As the winter wore on the aspect of affairs in Ireland became more settled; on more than one estate the Plan of Campaign signally failed, and agrarian outrages became of rare occurrence. Mr. Justice O'Brien, in opening the Leinster Winter Assizes at Tullamore (Dec. 5), said that the Winter Assize Court had returned to its normal state as regarded the public peace; almost all offences having their origin in wide social disturbance had disappeared. It was with great satisfaction he observed that the twelve counties embraced in the Assize had the good fortune to stand in a position of entire isolation from the area of disturbance, or it might be that the fever of crime to which they had been accustomed had exhausted itself. Whatever was the cause which produced this better state of things, they should rejoice. It was, of course, impossible, in accounting for a change of so remarkable a kind, to leave out of consideration one element, which was of supreme importance in this country above all others, that these results should be attributed to the steady influence of a firm and determined administration of the law in maintaining the public peace and in suppressing crime. On Dec. 20 Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., was released from Galway Gaol, and was met by a great crowd, including several of the Roman Catholic

clergy. On leaving Galway he drove to Loughlea to meet Dr. Duggan, the Bishop of Clonfert. Mr. O'Brien dined with the Bishop, and afterwards received addresses. In reply Mr. O'Brien strongly urged the representatives of the different parishes to work vigorously in the interests of the Tenants' Defence Association, and pointed out the marvellous interest taken in the Irish question by the Liberal party in England.

Towards the close of the year (Dec. 6) Captain Plunkett, one of the most energetic of the Irish police magistrates, died from tumour on the brain; the result, it was supposed, of a blow on the head received twelve months before in a riot at Youghal. On the whole, the year 1889 brought Ireland a larger share of peace and tranquillity than she had enjoyed for many years. The law was firmly though dispassionately administered. Agrarian outrage rapidly diminished, the Plan of Campaign languished, and even boycotting showed signs of a wasting energy. A good harvest and a rise in agricultural prices helped to support this improvement, which was shown not only in the criminal statistics, but also by the eager desire of tenants to purchase their holdings with the assistance of the grants under the Ashbourne Act.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

I. FRANCE.

WILL the year 1889 be regarded for France as a year's reprieve, or will it prove to be for Republican institutions what the "Day of Dupes" was in past history for Absolutism and the Monarchical system? The answer to this problem will be found in the future wisdom and conduct of the Republican party. Meanwhile she may with truth congratulate herself upon having escaped from the worst dangers, and one must go back as far as the times of Richelieu and the classical date of November 11, 1630, in order to find a parallel to the political crisis which was solved in so unexpected a fashion. The appearance on the walls of Paris (Jan. 8) of a manifesto of General Boulanger offering himself as a candidate for a vacant seat was the first act of the tragi-comedy of the year. This document was drawn up with considerable skill. It was impossible for a candidate for Paris not to assert his Republican sentiments; but inasmuch as it was necessary to reassure a strong contingent of Royalists and Bonapartists, General Boulanger declared himself the supporter of an "open and honest Republic." He accused the members of the Government of all sorts of fatal concessions and weaknesses, and appealed to all patriots for support.

The electoral campaign which ensued was, perhaps, the keenest ever remembered. The Monarchists understood at once the importance of General Boulanger's election for Paris. With the exception of the old *Gazette de France*, the organ of the pure Royalists, the majority of the party followed the lead of the *Gaulois* and its editor, M. Arthur Meyer. By this journal General Boulanger was by turns compared to a battering-ram, a catapult, or a cannon-ball, destined to make the breach by which the Monarchy should pass, or he was described as a quartermaster commissioned to prepare the lodging and the bed of the legitimate king. From the outset (Jan. 5) Monarchical committees decided to bring forward no candidate of their own, and outwardly recommended their adherents to abstain from voting. Meanwhile secret instructions were given to agitate in favour of

the General. The Imperialist committees (Jeromist and Victorian) openly commenced a campaign in favour of the popular soldier.

The Republican party, on its side, organised itself with great care and discipline. A meeting was called (Jan. 6) of the delegates of all the Republican committees in Paris, of the representatives of the Opportunist, Radical, and Socialist press, of Deputies, Senators, and Councillors of municipal Paris and of the suburbs. At both extremes of the Republican party defections were at once discovered. The *Journal des Débats* declined to take part in the proceedings. The Blanquists, who were looked upon as a sort of advance-guard, declared for a separate candidate, their choice falling upon a M. Boulé, one of their own set. As the result subsequently showed, they thus played the Boulangist game. After some deliberation the Republican Congress fixed upon M. Jacques, an honourable tradesman of the Montrouge district, as its candidate. Strictly speaking, he was an Autonomist, but personally most conciliatory and highly appreciated for his administrative talents. The choice of this useful, modest, and unknown citizen to oppose the brilliant General was in strict accordance with democratic principles, but might prove somewhat dangerous in electoral tactics.

It was a bad augury that on the very day on which this meeting was held two elections (Charente Inférieure and Somme) had resulted in the return of two Revisionists—M. Duapure, Bonapartist, at La Rochelle, and General Montaudon, Monarchist, at Amiens.

On the reassembling of the Senate (Jan. 8) M. Le Royer was re-elected for the eighth time President of the Senate without opposition. In the Chamber, however, there was a sharp contest for the President's chair, M. Méline, the former President, M. Clémenceau, and M. Andrieux offering themselves. It will be remembered that in the preceding year the two first-named candidates had obtained an equal number of votes, and that M. Méline had carried off the prize in consequence of his greater age. His rival was thus justified in again coming forward, but the candidature of M. Andrieux, a former Prefect of Police, was a Boulangist manoeuvre. At the first ballot, however, M. Méline obtained 181 votes, M. Clémenceau 106, and M. Andrieux 103; and on a second turn M. Méline was elected. This, although a satisfaction to the Moderate party, was in itself to be regretted, for this honourable statesman was wanting in those qualities necessary to impose order upon an assembly so divided and in a session destined to be so agitated.

For a while things went on smoothly. The new military law, which had often been under discussion, was at length voted by 369 against 169 votes, and transmitted to the Senate. On the other hand, the Minister of Finance, M. Peytral, had the mortification of seeing his Bill for an Income Tax promptly rejected by 12 to 5 in the committee to which it had been referred.

Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers and Deputy for the Finisterre, catechised the Foreign and Navy Ministers on the occupation of Easter Island by the Chilians and of Cook's Archipelago by the English. Admiral Krantz evaded the discussion by stating that in these distant countries France had no sort of interest.

In fact, at this moment nothing was thought of but the Paris election. During the three weeks which intervened the electors were called upon to bestir themselves by a perfect deluge of placards, addresses, street cries, speeches, and processions. A subscription was opened by the Republicans to cover the cost of the campaign, but the half-million francs subscribed scarcely sufficed to keep pace with the rising flood of Boulangist *affiches*. The most violent pamphlets against the Republic and Republicans were distributed in the streets. Troops of billstickers covered up the addresses of M. Jacques by those of the General. In some quarters it was even perilous to speak ill of the "brav' Général." Several well-known Republicans were attacked at Montmartre, and at one moment it seemed probable that the scenes which had marked the dawn of Boulangism at the Presidential crisis of 1887 would be renewed. There seemed, too, to be going on in the midst of the masses the work of some secret organisation, giving a rallying point to all the discontented, and creating for an invisible government a police and an army. At length the result of all this plotting was manifest. General Boulanger obtained (Jan. 27) 245,236 votes, M. Jacques 162,875, and the Socialist Boulé 17,039. The evening of the election day Paris seemed seized by a sort of delirium. Along the line of the boulevards it was impossible to preserve order. All carriages were stopped, and drivers and occupants forced to cry "Vive Boulanger!" Meanwhile the hero of the day, installed at the corner of the Rue Royale, surrounded by his friends, received the acclamation of the crowd.

The crushing victory of Boulangism produced a thorough panic in the Republican camp. The Chamber, it is true, voted (Jan. 31), by 300 to 240, an expression of confidence in the Ministry, but this was rather for the sake of discipline than from conviction. Discouragement was rife amongst the most faithful functionaries, while others thought only of keeping open a back door of escape, whilst from the provinces the majority of the Prefects raised a cry of alarm.

The Ministry recognised the gravity of the situation, and at once took steps to face it. It was impossible to deny the progress and organisation of Boulangism throughout France. A serious inquiry, set on foot by the Minister of the Interior and conducted by the Prefects, revealed the skilful tactics of the party. The *Ligue des Patriotes* served as the headquarters of a Garde Mobile, militarily organised, and capable of being mobilised in four hours. Its chief, M. Paul Déroulède, could thus, in less than five hours, concentrate upon any one point in Paris upwards

of 10,000 men, thoroughly trained, well armed, and of undoubted fidelity. The General's habit was to establish every Sunday evening his headquarters at some strategical point at equal distance from the Place de Paris, the Elysée, and the Ministry of the Interior, and within easy reach of the Ministry of War. Thence he might hope to attempt a *coup de main* should any favourable circumstances present themselves, and he might with a few determined men seize upon the essential centres of the government. This eventuality was the more to be feared as, in the case of a Boulangist insurrection, little confidence was to be placed in either the army or the police. Nearly all the barracks had been fields in which Boulangist agents had sowed their seeds with good results. Non-commissioned officers in great numbers, the majority of the rank and file, boldly avowed their feelings. Soldiers on leave filled railway stations and carriages with songs in honour of the General, and displayed in other ways their admiration. If this movement were allowed to continue throughout the year it was felt that the Republican cause would at the elections be in the greatest danger, and would have to give place to personal government. Already plans were being discussed as to whether the President of the Republic should be invited or forced to retire, and M. Boulanger declared, in an interview with the correspondent of an English newspaper, that he supported the view of nomination of the Chief of the State by universal suffrage. The line of defence taken by the Republicans was speedily settled. M. Floquet (Jan. 31) fired the first shot by presenting a Bill to re-establish uninominal election. An additional article suspended all elections until the end of the session. Urgency was proposed (Feb. 2) by a Bonapartist Deputy, and rejected by 353 to 171 votes, and by 463 to 33 it was decided to nominate a special commission—the majority opposed to Cæsarism thus showing increased strength. The debate upon a uninominal vote was destined to become the battlefield of parties. The Boulangists and extreme Radicals hoped to create a division amongst the Republicans by putting in the front rank the question of the revision of the Constitution. The Cabinet, with conspicuous wisdom and disinterestedness, sacrificed its own wishes to the general interest, and insisted (Feb. 9) on precedence for electoral law. In a single sitting this important question was decided. M. Floquet and M. Camille Dreyfus proposed the abolition of *scrutin de liste*. The motion was opposed by two Republicans—by M. Millerand, Deputy of the Seine, editor of *La Justice*, and one of M. Clémenceau's lieutenants, as well as by M. Jaurès, Deputy of the Tarn, a young philosopher of remarkable eloquence. The decision was a foregone conclusion, and the Chamber, by 290 to 266 votes, passed to the discussion of the clauses of the Bill. The Right, thinking that a certain number of Republican Deputies had been absent, and that their colleagues had voted for them, claimed a nominal

ballot for the final vote. This manœuvre turned against its authors, and the Bill was finally adopted by 268 to 262 votes. In the Senate, after a sitting of four hours, it was adopted by 228 to 54 votes.

The Floquet Ministry, however, did not long survive this victory; it proposed to the Chamber (Feb. 14) a motion for the Revision Bill so often promised and so long delayed. By 307 to 218 votes the Chamber refused to take the Bill into consideration. Thus the Radical Ministry of M. Floquet collapsed, as had done its immediate predecessor and many other Cabinets on the Revision question. But M. Floquet had this advantage, that he retired with dignity and the good wishes of all the sections of the Republican party. The Ministerial crisis lasted a week. M. Méline first undertook to form a Cabinet, but eventually declined the task, and M. Tirard, after four days' negotiations, presented (Feb. 23) the new Ministry to the Chambers. It was composed as follows:—M. Tirard, Senator (Seine), President of the Council, Minister of Commerce and Trade; M. Constans, Deputy (Haute-Garonne), formerly Resident in Indo-China, Interior; M. Thévenet, Deputy (Rhône), Justice and Keeper of the Seals; M. Eugène Spuller, Deputy (Côte d'Or), Foreign Affairs; M. Rouvier, Deputy (Bouches-du-Rhône), Finance; M. Yves Guyot, Deputy (Seine), Public Works; M. Faye, Senator, Agriculture; M. Fallières, Deputy (Lot-et-Garonne), Public Instruction; M. de Freycinet, Senator (Seine), War; Admiral Jaurès, life Senator, Marine and Colonies. Among the members of this Ministry two only, MM. Thévenet and Yves Guyot, had not held seats in one or other of the previous Cabinets. The former had made himself a reputation at Lyons by his ability as a barrister in commercial matters. He was also the political director of the old Republican journal *Le Siècle*. He entered the Chamber for the first time in 1885, and a single session had sufficed to place him in the first rank of parliamentary jurists. M. Yves Guyot, a Breton by birth, was a distinguished economist, an indefatigable worker, and a Free Trader. He had slowly made his reputation with the Parisian public by contributions to Radical newspapers, and more especially by his attacks on the police system. The organisation of the new Cabinet was subsequently slightly modified by decree (March 2), the Department of the Colonies being detached from the Ministry of Marine and added to that of Commerce and Trade. This department, formerly of little significance, now became one of the most important by the addition of the Posts and Telegraphs, the Colonies, and a portion of the Consulates. In its address to both Chambers (Feb. 23) the new Cabinet declared its intention to devote the whole efforts of the Government to the defence of the Republic, to enforce discipline in all constituted bodies, and to bring before Parliament practical measures rather than purely political questions. During the Parliamentary interregnum a strange incident had happened in a French colony on

the shores of the Red Sea. A Russian subject named Atchinoff had organised a half military, half religious expeditionary mission into the interior of Abyssinia. He commenced by establishing himself in a small fort at Sagallo in the Bay of Tadjourah, and, on being summoned to evacuate the French possession, he absolutely refused. Forthwith (Feb. 17) the French gunboat *Primauguet* commenced the bombardment of the fort. The following day Rear-Admiral Olry, commander-in-chief on the station, arrived on the scene. He again summoned Atchinoff to evacuate the fort, and on the latter's refusal, the Admiral disembarked a company of soldiers, stormed the fort, disarmed the Russians, and sent them back with marks of consideration to Odessa. A few men and women having been wounded in this affair, the Patriots' League seized upon the occasion to make a violent protest against the conduct of the French Government. Paul Déroulède, in his manifesto, asserted that the conduct of the French had been such as to wound the national feelings of Russia, and to prevent any cordial alliance between the two Governments. A Radical Deputy, M. Hubbard, hurt by this supposition, addressed to the Foreign Minister a question which was subsequently taken up as an interpellation by the Bonapartist Deputy, M. Delafosse. The Chamber, by an unanimous order of the day, endorsed the declaration of sympathy with the Russian people made by the Government. The incident, being thus closed from the parliamentary point of view, entailed no diplomatic results, but it was destined to be fruitful in singular consequences for the internal policy of France.

M. Constans, the Minister of the Interior, was not likely to pass without notice the course adopted by the Patriots' League. He was a man of well-known energy, as he had proved on the very day after his entry into the Cabinet. The Boulangist section of the Socialist party, which had adopted a very strange attitude in the election of General Boulanger, proposed to organise in all the towns of France a grand manifestation in honour of the proclamation of the Republic of 1848 (Feb. 24). The delegates of the various syndical chambers and the working men were to present themselves at the respective Hôtels de Ville and Prefectures of their respective towns, and to demand from the Prefects and Mayors measures of relief for the working classes. M. Constans at once dispatched an order to all Prefects forbidding them to receive such deputations, and if necessary to arrest the leaders. This display of energy sufficed to put an end to the fictitious agitation, although a few were arrested at Troyes, Nantes, and St. Quentin.

The incident of the Patriots' League was far more fruitful in its results. Legal proceedings were forthwith (Feb. 24) commenced against this association. The head office of the League in the Place de la Bourse was entered by the police and the papers there found carried off, and subsequently domiciliary

visits were made to the houses of certain members of the society. Generally, these searches were perhaps intentionally fruitless; nevertheless they sufficed to make known the importance of the organisation which the League had acquired; and when the Boulangist Deputy Laguerre appealed against the violence and arbitrary acts of the Government the Chamber, by 348 to 220 votes, supported its action. The Cabinet, after a slight hesitation, chose this moment (March 7) to allow the Duc d'Aumale to return to France, and this act of clemency was generally approved. The attitude of the Prince whilst in exile had been most circumspect, and he had even displayed rare generosity in giving during his lifetime and after his banishment his magnificent domain of Chantilly to the Institute of France. He had, moreover, openly blamed his nephew for his attitude towards the Boulangist party. The Radicals, however, of the Clémenceau group found fault with the Duke's recall, and M. Camille Pelletan addressed an interpellation to the Ministry on the subject. Its outcome, however, was altogether unexpected, for M. Floquet, the late Minister, ascended the Tribune and formally declared that his Government was about to take the same steps when it was overturned. The order of the day was accepted by the Government and voted by 316 to 147 votes. M. Millerand seized this opportunity of asking once more an amnesty in favour of those condemned for political and military causes, but the debate was postponed by 345 to 153. A large majority decided (March 14) to authorise the proceedings against MM. Laguerre, Turquet, and Laisant, members of the Patriots' League, whilst a similar permission was accorded by the Senate, by 213 to 58 votes, with regard to M. Naquet. It was obvious that a sharp struggle was about to take place between the Ministry and Boulangists, and the moment was an unfortunate one for M. Léon Say to attempt to form a third party under the title of the Liberal Union. A few of his old adherents rallied to the call, but as a rule the younger Republicans stood aloof. It was therefore on the Ministries of the Interior and of Justice that the weight of the struggle fell, and General Boulanger's friends, displaying great foresight, did their utmost to get rid of both M. Constans and M. Thévenet. A collapse in the copper market had caused the Comptoir d'Escompte to suspend payment, and an effort was made to compromise the Minister of Justice in this matter. M. Laure's motion, however (March 21), resulted only in an order of the day directed against speculators, which could harm nobody, whilst M. Laguerre's attempt to prove the Minister of the Interior to have been guilty of concussion in 1882 had a similar result. M. Constans replied that on his return from Tonquin the Boulangists had done everything to enlist him on their side, and that in 1885 General Boulanger himself had telegraphed to him from Tunis, on the fall of the Ferry Ministry, asking to be appointed Minister of War in the new Cabinet. A slight but insignificant change in the *personnel* of

the Cabinet ensued upon the death of Admiral Jaurès, whose place was temporarily filled by Admiral Krantz.

In the Senate the Ministry were not less successful. A law which for some time had been in preparation, giving to the Senate the powers of a High Court of Justice, was rapidly voted (March 20) by 207 to 63, and the Government at last found itself fully equipped for its campaign against M. Boulanger. This new weapon was to be turned to account without delay. It was, however, understood (April 1) that the Procureur-Général of the Paris Courts, M. Bouchez, had refused to sign the authority for prosecuting M. Boulanger, and had consequently resigned the post to which he had been suddenly promoted at the time of the Wilson scandal, in which his integrity had not been altogether unquestioned. On the present occasion he was doubtful of the ultimate victory of the Republicans, and withdrew in order not to damage the cause of the National party. His successor was the Avocat-Général Quesnay de Beaurepaire, a distinguished writer and a skilful speaker. The Boulangist organs of every description at once commenced a violent campaign against the Home Minister, the Keeper of the Seals, and the Procureur-Général, who found themselves but feebly protected by judges, who inflicted ridiculously small fines for the most defamatory and outrageous libels. The Republican cause, however, was growing in strength, and suddenly (April 1) General Boulanger fled from Paris and took refuge at Brussels. His departure was at first denied by the principal lieutenants of the General, but a few days later Rochefort and Dillon followed their chief's example. The consternation in the Boulangist camp was great. In vain did the chief address manifestoes to the French people and letters to the Paris electors. The reaction was beginning.

On the other hand, the deliberation with which the proceedings against the fugitive were conducted strengthened the position of the Cabinet. A formal demand was laid before the Chamber requesting authority to prosecute General Boulanger for plotting against the State. The reading of the indictment drawn up by M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire (April 4) brought matters to a crisis. After a noisy sitting the Chamber decided by 365 to 220 votes at once to name a committee to examine the proposal, and to report the result the same evening. Eleven members were at once named, one for each *bureau*, and by 10 votes to 1 they decided to grant the requisite authority. A second sitting followed immediately, in spite of the violent objections of the Right to pursue the debate. M. P. de Cassagnac was unsparing in his insults to his colleagues. The Vendean gentleman, M. Baudry d'Asson, went so far as to thrust his fist under the nose of the President of the Chamber, and the Breton M. Le Hérissé was formally censured; nevertheless, the proceedings were authorised by 353 to 179. There still, however, remained one more vote to obtain from the Chamber—the rati-

fication of the law, passed by the Senate, constituting that body a High Court of Justice. In the course of the debate (April 9) Mgr. Freppel declared that this vote would reopen the era of proscriptions, whilst other members of the Right resorted to every artifice and obstruction in order to postpone the final decision. Nineteen divisions were called, and two sittings were held with an interval of five minutes. At length the law was voted by 303 to 221, and the Chamber separated for the Easter holidays. The Senate held one more sitting, but in its quality of a High Court of Justice, when M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire explained the grounds on which he proposed to proceed against MM. Boulanger, Rochefort, and Dillon. The High Court thereupon constituted itself *en Chambre du Conseil*, and decided that the prosecution should proceed. With this object a committee of investigation was named, composed of nine Senators, consisting of MM. Merlin, Cazot, Cordelet, Erarieux, Munier, de Marcère, Demôle, Laverujon, and Morellet. This committee at once set about interrogating the witnesses cited or spontaneously offering themselves, by directing searches in the houses of the principal Boulangists, and by arresting certain persons who were speedily set at liberty. For a while the organs of the Boulangists ridiculed these proceedings, whilst the public in no way realised their importance. Nevertheless the energy displayed by the Government in combating Boulangism might have had the same result in 1889 as in 1887-8 had it not been for the powerful derivative counter-attraction offered by the Universal Exhibition and the centenary fêtes. The President of the Republic not only seized the opportunity of placing himself in more intimate relations with the population of Paris, but showed himself as the ornamental head and dignified host of a great nation. In his hospitalities and displays he was admirably seconded by the Municipal Council of Paris, of which the President, Dr. Chautemps, distinguished himself by his courtesy on all occasions in which he was called upon to represent the city of Paris.

The fêtes of the centenary commenced (May 5) by an imposing ceremony intended to recall the meeting of the States-General at Versailles, at which it was calculated upwards of 260,000 persons were conveyed from Paris in the day. On leaving the Elysée a former clerk in the navy yard at Martinique, who considered himself a victim of harsh treatment, discharged a pistol at the President; but this trifling incident passed unperceived in the midst of the fêtes which excited that exhibition fever which was destined to combat efficaciously the Boulangist malaria. The steady return of confidence in the Government was apparent to all who watched the course of events. A week after the opening of the Exhibition a senatorial election for the Department of the Seine resulted in the return of the moderate candidate, M. Poirrier, over the Radical nominee, M. Lefevre. On the reassembling of the Chambers.

(May 14) it was speedily seen that the last hours of the Legislature would be agitated, but the contrast furnished by the pacific activity exhibited in the Champ de Mars proved to the most superficial observers that what was passing in Parliament was but the effervescence of a laborious and pacific nation. The Chamber, too, on its part, was anxious to terminate its troubled career with some show of a sense of responsibility; for once the Budget was voted at a reasonable date. It is true that all attempt at subjecting the Budget of 1890 to reform or control had to be abandoned; the Government undertook to change as little as possible the estimates adopted for the previous year, limiting its efforts to a few reductions. The important modifications of taxation recognised by everyone as indispensable were postponed until the following year. Nevertheless the general discussion on the Budget offered a considerable interest, because the various parties repeated and condensed their habitual arguments in attacking the financial policy of the last few years. After the speeches of MM. Amagat d'Alliers, on behalf of the Right, Rouvier, Camille Dreyfus, Burdeau, general reporter of the Budget Committee, for the Left, the general discussion was brought to a close (May 21); whilst in the debates on the details the most noteworthy speeches were those of Bishop Freppel on the Embassy to the Vatican (June 4) and of M. Jules Ferry (June 6) on the subject of the Budget of the Minister of Public Instruction. The former Premier and principal author of the law in favour of lay, obligatory, and free education boldly claimed for the Republic the gratitude of peasants and artisans alike, and in a word of all classes of French citizens.

Towards the end of the month the President of the Republic started on a visit to the principal centres of industry in the north, and inaugurated the new docks and other works at Boulogne. On his return he was received with more than ordinary enthusiasm by the shopkeepers and workmen of Paris.

Meanwhile the proceedings of the High Court were to outward appearance slowly dragging on, giving to the Boulangist Deputies an excuse for complaining of the somnolence of the Commission. M. Laguerre's attempt, however, to force an explanation from M. Constans was set aside as unconstitutional. Boulangists, however, had not long to wait before changing their tone, and recognising that the proceedings of the Commission were serious. Suddenly (June 7) it was announced that M. Reichert, an important functionary in the Ministry of War, had been arrested on the charge of having concealed important documents. After a few hours M. Reichert was set at liberty, but his arrest had put the Commission on the track of an enormous quantity of papers belonging to General Boulanger, hidden in a draper's shop in the Rue des Abbesses, Montmartre. This discovery was a terrible blow to the party; it not only placed in the hands of the Government proofs of the plot organised by the

General and of his numerous prevarications on various occasions, but it revealed the names of the functionaries who maintained suspicious relations with him. The Government was now able to strike with certainty the agents of its adversary, and it forthwith dismissed a large number of persons so compromised both in Paris and in the Departments. The Boulangists pushed to extremities now endeavoured to hinder, by all possible means, the progress of the trial. MM. Laguerre, Laisant, and Déroulède were arrested (June 9) at Angoulême, and in reply to a question on this subject, M. Constans declared that the Government would cause the law to be respected. After two hours of noisy dispute the Chamber declined to discuss the matter further.

The Minister of the Interior showed equal energy in dealing with the strike of Paris cabmen. Taking advantage of the enormous number of strangers attracted by the Exhibition, the cab-drivers decided to go out on strike and to hinder those who were willing to pursue their calling. In the preceding year a strike of the navvies in the middle of summer had been the cause of serious inconvenience; but that of the cabmen took a much more serious form, and many acts of violence were committed in the public streets. Naturally the Boulangists took advantage of the opportunity, sending speakers to the meetings organised by the strikers. In vain the syndical chambers, whilst supporting the strike, urged its members to abstain from violence; the more reasonable were outvoted by the more noisy, and it seemed inevitable that the Exhibition of 1889 would be disturbed as had been those of 1878 and 1867. M. Constans, however, promptly took the matter in hand. Stringent orders were issued to the police to protect the public, and those who displayed any laxity were promptly dismissed. Patrols of the Municipal Guards were stationed along the boulevards, and the cab ranks were protected by bodies of police. In two days the strike had collapsed. This incident in itself was, perhaps, of little importance, but it was productive of important results. It gave the Government an opportunity of proving, in a convincing manner, its intention of keeping order in the streets, and the peaceful habitants of Paris, for a long while victims of the noises and rushes of the *camelots*, welcomed with satisfaction this revival of authority.

In the Chamber the debates on the Budget were steadily continued and several new laws were voted, such as that which modified the nationality of the children of foreigners born in France, and one fixing the pensions of retired officers. The ever-recurring military law having been returned from the Senate with several amendments which the Chamber refused to accept, the Government commenced by nominating a mixed committee of Senators and Deputies in the hope of arriving at a settlement, but after a few meetings it was dissolved without having come to an understanding. The Minister of War, M. de Freycinet

(May 9), hereupon proposed to the Chamber to pass the law in the form in which it had been sent down from the Senate. He displayed in this attempt his wonderful talents as a negotiator, and succeeded in persuading the members of the Left to allow the privileges accorded to seminarists and students, and to fix at three years the period of military service. It may also be noted that the Senate passed a law recognising the claims of village schoolmasters to State pay, whilst the Chamber of Deputies accorded to women the right of voting at elections for the tribunals of commerce, but not recognising their eligibility to sit on them. A last precaution was adopted against the Boulangists. Several Republican Deputies had taken the initiative to present Bills for preventing multiple candidatures. By the press this proposal had not been received with favour, being regarded as a violation of the rights of universal suffrage. The proposed Bills were by no means identical. Some sought to prevent the same candidate offering himself for more than three seats, others limited the number of seats to two, whilst others again more logical declared in favour of a single nomination; and as the fatal moment of dissolution approached, the majority of the Republicans rallied to this measure of public safety. This decision exasperated the Boulangists beyond measure, and violent scenes recurred daily in the Chamber. A former Prefect of Police, M. Andrieux, threatened with his fist (July 1) the Ministers in their places. Ten days later the Deputy Laguerre, having attacked the proceedings of the High Court of Justice, was called upon by the President to withdraw. On his refusal to quit the Tribune the sitting was suspended for a few minutes and the House adjourned; on reassembling M. Laguerre was found still occupying the Tribune, and again refused to withdraw. The Chamber at once passed a vote of censure upon the obstinate Deputy, suspending him temporarily, and bringing the sitting to a close. Two days later (July 13) M. Le Hérissé attempted to recommence the game of obstruction, but he was promptly censured and temporarily excluded; on his refusal to withdraw the sitting was suspended, and M. Le Hérissé was removed by force. In this way there was created for the Chamber a new jurisprudence, of which it found the use in subsequent sittings, applying it with mathematical rigour. On the eve of its dissolution (July 13) the Chamber had under discussion the new law of multiple candidatures. By this law it was forbidden to every citizen to present himself for more than one seat, and prescribed the terms in which a previous declaration must be made at the Prefecture. The Minister of the Interior informed by the Prefect then authorised the latter to hand to the candidate a receipt of his declaration. Candidates not presenting themselves five days before the poll rendered their nomination ineligible. Any printer causing to be displayed electoral addresses of a candidate unprovided with the Prefectural receipt rendered himself liable to

heavy penalties and a fine of 10,000 francs. This law did not pass without opposition, even the Republicans protesting against its stringency. The young and eloquent Jaurès spoke in high-flown language of the rights of universal suffrage, and of the moral strength of the Republic. M. Henri Brisson, one of the patriarchs of democracy, on the other hand, defended the Bill, and the intervention of this tried Liberal and trusted leader caused the Bill to be carried by 304 to 229 votes. M. Brisson's speech was ordered to be affixed in every village throughout the country.

The Senate once more passed the Budget with little or no debate, according to its only two brief sittings; it treated the law of multiple candidatures with similar expedition, and in return the Chamber adopted the Amnesty Bill of the Government in the form amended by the Senate. The closing day of the session (July 15) was marked by an unusual incident. The Government had obtained from the Chamber a credit of 58,000,000 francs for the improvement of the navy. The Bill embodying this grant was brought to the Senate at the last moment and just as the evening sitting was about to commence news arrived that the Ministry had read in the Chamber the message of prorogation; the Senate consequently was unable legally to sit, and the President, M. Humbert, having sturdily refused to permit the discussion of the Bill, the Minister of Agriculture was forced to read the closing speech. Thus closed the fourth Parliament which had been called together since the revision of the Constitution in 1875. It had been elected by *scrutin de liste*, but it had wholly falsified the supporters of that method of voting; instead of representing great currents of political feeling, it had been more broken up than even its predecessors, the products of *scrutin d'arrondissement*. It must, however, be allowed that in the last month of its existence it had displayed more discipline and more energy than its critics had anticipated; it had passed many laws of great social value; had in some degrees diminished the continuous increase of expenditure; had strengthened the army, and at length had passed the famous military law which had been under discussion since the days of Gambetta.

The first electoral contest arose out of the renewal of one-half of the Conseils Généraux. The elections of 1886, it will be remembered, had been the first serious check to the Republicans and the first victory of the Monarchists. In many Departments the majority had passed from the Left to the Right. Would this movement continue, or would the Republicans recover their lost ground? The question was the more complicated by the inevitable intervention of Boulangism. The General decided to take advantage of these elections in nearly every Department. A manifesto (July 18) announced that the chief of the national party would offer himself in eighty cantons; as a matter of fact it was officially declared in 120, and placards.

were posted and voting cards distributed in nearly 400. An enormous effort had been made, but the result was insignificant; in only 12 cantons was a majority polled by the fugitive. The attempted plébiscite had turned against its author. The Republicans held their own positions, carrying 825 seats, and the Reactionists only 422. The following week the ballotings were favourable to 120 Republicans, and to only 48 Reactionists and 5 Boulangists. From this moment the ultimate victory of the Republic was assured the current of public opinion had changed its course. In vain the General launched manifesto after manifesto appealing "to the people, my only judge," and denouncing the violence of those in power. Everything conspired against the General's cause: the brilliant fêtes of the Exhibition, favoured by cloudless weather, enjoyed by enormous crowds, made M. Carnot more popular in Paris than any sovereign had been, nor did the President omit anything which might bring the provincial authorities under the fascination of Paris. The mayors of all the towns and villages of the country, more than 1,800 in number, were invited to a national banquet. Workmen delegates were entertained by the Municipal Council, and representatives of all classes and nations were welcomed to the capital.

Meanwhile the proceedings of the High Court of Justice were approaching their term. MM. Boulanger, Rochefort, and Dillon were cited (July 28) before the High Court before which (Aug. 8) the Procureur-Général made his statement charging these leaders with an attempt against the safety of the State and misappropriation of public money. In the Senate, on its first assembling (Aug. 12) as a High Court of Justice, the Right proposed a motion denying its competence and demanded that the suit should be remitted to a jury. On the following day a majority having declared itself competent to decide on a charge of conspiracy against the State, the members of the Right withdrew. Boulanger was thereupon found guilty of conspiracy by 206 against 6 and of an attempt against the State by 198 against 12 votes. Finally (Aug. 14) he was by 195 against 5, and 10 abstentions, found guilty of having appropriated public money. His accomplices were at the same time found guilty by almost equally large majorities. Furthermore the High Court condemned them all, in their absence, to imprisonment in a fortress. The following day appeared a manifesto from the General and his two colleagues protesting against the sentence of the High Court, but the time had gone by for the General to recover his lost popularity by manifestoes. His flight had irremediably compromised his reputation for courage; the revelations of the indictment, showing his relations with adventurers of the worst type, had disgusted the more respectable of his followers; and in a few weeks the Boulangist party was reduced to a mere group of Reactionists and seceders from the Republican party.

A date having been fixed for the new elections, each party appeared before the public; the Comte de Paris put forth (Aug. 30) a manifesto which seemed a paraphrase of the Boulangist appeals. A declaration from Prince Victor appeared in the *Figaro* (Sept. 4), and a few days later the Committee of Twelve who presided over the electoral campaign of the Right explained its platform. On the other hand the Government was not inactive. M. de Freycinet, Minister of War, had, on the formal demand of his colleagues, to proceed against several officers from whom compromising letters had been found amongst General Boulanger's papers. Categorical instructions were at the same time dispatched by the heads of other departments enjoining their subordinates to support the Government in the coming struggle. The Minister of Public Worship addressed to the archbishops and bishops a strongly worded circular on the intervention of the clergy in political matters. This letter provoked sharp replies from several bishops, and the advantage of the circular was rendered more than doubtful by the hostile attitude it provoked amongst the Catholic clergy. The electoral period, however, passed over far more quietly than might have been anticipated from the recent introduction of the American system into French political life. Among the most noteworthy incidents of the struggle was the list of candidates accepted by the National Committee and published by the Boulangist newspapers. This list divided its favourites into two classes, Republicans *d'origine*, those who had quitted their former faith, and Republicans *ralliés*, amongst whom were included the names of MM. Robert Mitchell, d'Espenilles, de Bourgoing, Delafosse, and others, the designation of whom as Republicans must have somewhat surprised their electors. On the day originally fixed (Sept. 22) the elections were held throughout the country. The first return showed the approaching triumph of the Republicans, 229 of their candidates being elected, whilst the Boulangists and Reactionaries combined only seated 160. In no less than 180 places a second ballot was found requisite, but this further trial of strength was even more disastrous to the coalition, for those electors who wished to be on the winning side then threw in their lot with the Government; the result was that the final polling (Oct. 6) gave 366 to the Republicans in the new Chamber, opposed to 233 anti-Republicans of all shades. Amongst the defeated candidates a larger number of former Deputies was to be found than on any similar occasion since the establishment of the Republic, and no less than 282 Deputies entered the Chamber for the first time. At the same time all the Ministers had been re-elected to the Chamber, the vigorous policy of M. Constans and his colleagues thus obtaining a bill of indemnity from the electors. The Republican party, however, had to support the loss of M. Jules Ferry, defeated at St. Dié by a new comer, M. Picot. Although Paris had elected amongst

its members M. Henri Brisson, a distinguished Republican, it had nevertheless returned in other districts several Boulangists. General Boulanger himself had stood for the Clignancourt Division of Montmartre, the most populous in all Paris; he there polled 8,303 votes against a working-man candidate, M. Joffrin, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Municipal Council, who was supported by 5,500 electors. Notwithstanding this the Revisional Committee declared that General Boulanger, having been deprived of his civic rights by the decision of the High Court, was unable to take advantage of the voting papers bearing his name. By a singular anomaly M. Dillon, who had obtained a majority at Lorient, was duly returned by the committee of that town.

The interval between the elections and the meeting of the Chambers was marked by no incident of importance. General Boulanger quitted London and established himself at Jersey; General Ferrier was appointed Chancellor of the Legion of Honour in succession to the late General Faidherbe; and M. Barbé, Senator, was appointed Minister of Marine in succession to Admiral Krantz, who found himself at variance with the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, M. Etienne. The Chamber, on its reassembling, was promptly constituted in spite of the efforts of the Right to hinder the validation of the elections. M. Floquet was elected President on the first ballot by 384 votes, the largest majority ever accorded to a candidate for this office; a fitting reward for his conduct as leader of the Radical party since the defeat of his Cabinet. The programme of the Government was read before both Chambers (Nov. 19) and was limited to the promise of placing in the first rank questions concerning internal interests. The Chamber was called upon before all things to take into consideration the important question of the renewal or denunciation of the treaties of commerce which would expire during its term of existence. The timidity of the Government after its success at the elections surprised everyone, and was regarded generally as foreshadowing an approaching crisis and as the evidence of internal dissension in the Cabinet. Nothing, however, happened before the close of the year to justify this view.

At the same time that the new Chamber displayed more than ordinary sagacity and circumspection, it refused (Nov. 19) urgency for the proposal of M. Maujean in favour of revision; it validated (Dec. 9) the election of M. Joffrin at Montmartre by 371 to 243 votes, voted (Dec. 14) by 290 to 192 the Secret Service money for the Minister of the Interior which the previous Chamber had negatived, and generally displayed great moderation in reviewing the Boulangist elections. If numerous invalidations were pronounced for Paris and its suburbs where scandalous disorders had taken place, the majority was generally indulgent toward doubtful proceedings in the provinces, and the session closed (Dec. 23) without further trouble.

M. Constans himself ended the year by a personal success, being chosen Senator in the Haute-Garonne by the united Republican party. At the close of the year the Moderate party found itself as strong as ever; the Republic was so well established that many Monarchists seemed ready to renounce an opposition henceforward useless, whilst the success of the Exhibition had restored confidence in business affairs which a serious epidemic raging over Paris and the whole of France did not destroy.

The Budget for the year 1890 placed the ordinary receipts at 3,046,417,120 francs, and the expenditure at 3,046,020,874 francs, but the total of the expenditure included in the ordinary Budget was notably increased by the precipitate passing of various laws for which no corresponding provision had been made. For instance, the adoption of the new military law entailed an additional expenditure of nearly 10 millions of francs, whilst the suppression of the one-year volunteer system caused a loss of 4,702,500 francs, the amount of the payments made by those conditionally engaged. The re-establishment also of the Secret Service Fund of the Ministry of the Interior further increased the deficit, and finally the new match monopoly voted by the Chamber just before its rising necessitated the payment of a large indemnity to the company which had hitherto formed this source of revenue.

The expenses of the public debt amounted to 1,318,248,408 francs, representing about 31 milliards of capital. In 1886 the interest had been 1,333 millions; but this slight diminution, in spite of the conversion which had taken place under the Rouvier Ministry in 1887, did not indicate any decrease of the debt, but was rather due to a reduction of the terms of the Sinking Fund.

The cost of the public services in round numbers was as follows:—Ministry of War, 556 millions; Marine, 203; Public Works, 170; Public Instruction and Fine Arts, 152; collection of taxes, &c. 329,893,085 francs.

The principal sources of receipt were 448½ millions from direct taxation, 1,075 from indirect taxes, and 592 the produce of certain monopolies. To the ordinary expenditure, however, must be further added the sum of 154 millions allotted to the Minister of War for the conversion of bills at short date and an extraordinary budget of receipts and expenditure amounting to 475½ millions, for which funds were obtained from special sources. The increase of the supplementary and parasitic branches of the ordinary Budget called for the attention of all statesmen, and made the necessity of a new loan evident. In a word, if the Budget was not altogether satisfactory, French credit was not seriously involved. By economy in expenditure and in rearrangement of existing taxation the necessary reforms might be effected, and to obtain this result nothing seemed wanting in the peaceful state of affairs at home and abroad.

II. ITALY.

The opening of the year presaged troublous times for Italy. The early winter had been marked by serious financial difficulties which seemed the possible prelude of a greater catastrophe, an agrarian crisis in the north amongst the populous districts of Lombardy, bankruptcies in the south among the wine-growers, who were unable to dispose of their products even by the intervention of Spanish merchants, and above all symptoms of lax discipline in the army. Such were a few of the prognostics of which the year's course was to prove the falseness. In comparing the state of Italy at the commencement of 1889 with the situation at its close, the improvement in the state of trade has been only less marked than in the condition of the political horizon.

During the parliamentary recess an incident, slight in itself, but magnified by polemical discussion, attracted general attention. General Mattei, having expressed in a newspaper article his disapproval of the Ministerial policy, was forthwith placed on half-pay. The Radical and Irredentist press loudly protested against this act of rigour, but the Cabinet maintained its decision in order to show that in Italy no opening arose for a general who might desire to become a leader of faction.

The treaty of commerce with Switzerland, which had been under discussion for so many years, was at length (Jan. 23) signed. It was chiefly interesting to the outside world as showing upon what conditions a Protectionist State such as Italy could find terms of agreement with the almost Free Trade policy of Switzerland.

The opening of the parliamentary session (Jan. 28) was marked by an animated attack from the Opposition led by Signor Cavallotti, on Signor Crispi's foreign policy. It was, however, on the financial question that real difficulties arose. Pessimists were eagerly spreading the rumour that the deficit of 1889-90 would not fall short of 190 millions of lire. Almost simultaneously a sharp crisis in the building trade brought about serious disorders in Rome itself; large bodies of men on strike assembled (Feb. 8) in the streets of Rome, some shops were plundered, and many arrests were made. The Left Opposition at once took advantage of this opportunity to harass the Ministry. Signor Bonghi appealed to the Chamber of Deputies to nominate a commission composed of nine members to report on the economical condition of the kingdom. Two days later Signor Marcerra catechised the Prime Minister on the motives which led to forbidding the Liberal clubs of Milan celebrating the anniversary day of the martyrs of 1853. After several days of discussion the Chamber adopted by 247 against 115 votes (Feb. 16) an order of the day by Signor Del Giudice and accepted by the Government. Although thirty-six members

had held aloof from the division, it may be taken that these figures fairly represented the state of parties at the beginning of the year.

Notwithstanding this defeat Signor Baccarini, a former Minister of Public Works, who had gone over to the Opposition, proposed the appointment of a commission of eighteen members to draw up a report within fifty days on the possible savings, reductions, and postponements on the estimates of the various departments. He especially indicated as feasible a reduction of 20 millions of lire on the extraordinary expenses of the railroads, of 8 millions on the cost of the African expedition, and above all upon the extraordinary budgets of the army and navy. This motion was rejected, but with the object of strengthening his personal authority by a renewal of its grant, Signor Crispi offered (Feb. 28) his own resignation and that of his colleagues. It was in reality nothing more than the imitation of those pretended withdrawals to which Signor Depretis had annually accustomed the Italian Parliament, and the King at once instructed Signor Crispi to form a new Cabinet, which differed only from its predecessor by the addition of a Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, who in the first instance was Signor Lacava.

Far from showing any disposition to limit the operations of Italy in Africa, the Government no longer confined its attention to Massowah, but turned to the coast possessions of the Somalis. At the beginning of March the Italian Consul at Zanzibar promised to the Sultan of Obbi the protection of his Government. This news on reaching Rome at once gave rise (March 19) to interpellations by the Deputies Della Valle and De Rudini, but Signor Crispi explained that the preceding Sultan had ceded Kisimigo to Italy, and that in according Italian protection to the new sovereign of Obbi the Government had acted most prudently and had acquired an important protectorate without the cost of a single lira.

A few days later (March 22) a Milanese Deputy, Signor Cavalotti, brought up a more serious matter arising out of a political trial at Piacenza. A letter had been read written in 1878 by Colonel Corvetto, then in garrison at Palermo, but who had since become a general and Chief Secretary to the Ministry of War. This letter contained the following passage:—"It is lucky for Italy that she has only one Sicily; there are plenty of honest people here, but they are trampled upon by the rabble and public authority is very weak." General Corvetto had been summoned as a witness in a suit against the newspaper *Il Progresso* in consequence of its articles on General Mattei's revelations. He had at first questioned the authenticity of the letter, but subsequently had been forced to recognise its genuineness. Signor Cavalotti having brought the matter before the Chamber, accused the General of being untruthful, and expressed his surprise at seeing him in so important a post. An indescribable tumult followed these words; a duel was admitted to be inevitable, and in the sequel Signor

Cavalotti wounded (March 24) his adversary with a severe blow from a cavalry sabre.

The same day, in the Chamber there had been a warm debate over an extraordinary credit of 400,000 lire which the Government demanded in order to subventionise Italian schools abroad. In voting this sum, the Chamber did it grudgingly, indicating its disbelief in the attempted propaganda of Italian influence by means of schools and books. The vote in reality was but the carrying out of a former policy: in 1888 a number of inspectors had been appointed to report on the Italian schools in Tunis, Tripoli, Egypt, Syria, and Albania, but after a short absence they had been recalled, and the idea was temporarily abandoned.

At this moment the Cabinet was most eager to show that it separated itself entirely from the policy of the Irredentists, who had taken advantage of the agricultural crisis to recruit their ranks. In this way they were able to score an important victory (Mar. 25) by returning a deputy, Signor Renato Imbriani, who had invented his own title—*Irredentissimo*. A few days later there was established at Rome a Patriotic Society entitled *La Società Dante Alighiere*, on the model of the *Alliance Française* established in Paris in 1884. Its object was to disseminate the Italian language by private initiative, especially in the Italian provinces of Austria. Whilst, however, individuals were uniting in this work, the Government was forced by diplomatic necessity to hold itself aloof. When, therefore, Baron Blanc, the Italian Ambassador at Constantinople, handed to Said Pasha a note by which the Italian Government asked permission from the Ottoman Ministry to inspect Italian schools established in Turkey, he promised only to receive into such schools Mussulman children provided with certificates from the elementary schools, or Ruchdias. The importance attached to these questions of instruction along the shores of the Mediterranean is one of the phases of the rivalry of European States. The struggle of languages tends to substitute itself for that of faiths, and is, possibly, of greater importance in political difficulties.

During the discussion in the Senate of the Swiss Treaty of Commerce, the Government was urged to take in hand more systematically the suppression of smuggling; but if on this and on Abyssinian affairs a free hand was allowed by the Senate to the Cabinet, Signor Crispi's policy was to encounter strong opposition at his own council table. The Negus, Johannes, had been defeated and killed by the Dervishes, and on the arrival of the news a debate ensued (April 14) which was to divide the Ministry. Signor Zanardelli declared himself opposed to any colonial policy which involved the employment of Italian troops. Signori Seismit-Doda, Miceli, Giolitti, Lacava, inclined to the same view, for the reason of economy, and General Bertole Viale, Minister of War, urged the necessity of avoiding everything which might compromise the mobilisation of the army; in a word, Signor Crispi

found himself in a minority, and forced to postpone, until the autumn, the question of an advance beyond the Soati. This decision was, as will be seen, rendered useless by the circumstances which made Menelek the successor of the Negus. With the re-opening of the session this topic at once came to the front. Signor Sonnino Sidney, who had been Under-Secretary of State in 1888, inquired why advantage had not been taken of the state of affairs to secure a defensive frontier, and protect the territory occupied by the Italians, and offer better guarantee of the health of the troops. Signor Costa, on the other hand, was opposed to any aggressive policy, whilst Signor Bonghi warmly attacked the proceedings of the War Department, and Signor Miosi closed the debate by calling for a Parliamentary inquiry into the acts of that department. The motion was rejected by 278 to 33 votes; and this small minority, which had prolonged the debate for so many days, was not one of the least noteworthy incidents of Italian Parliamentary life.

Meanwhile, the agricultural crisis became more and more intense in Pugli. The wine-merchants were, in consequence of the tariff war with France, unable to dispose of their goods. An interpellation in the Chamber on this subject (April 10) was marked by a question from Signor Bonghi as to the measures the Government proposed to take to bring about a solution of the crisis. On this occasion the Irredentist deputy made a maiden speech marked by extreme violence. "To what profit is," he asked, "our alliance with the central European powers? To nothing, except that it makes us do our masters' bidding." Signor Crispi protested against such language, but the deputy of Pugli replied that Signor Crispi himself had used similar language when (May 18, 1886) he had accused the Government of having made Italy the policeman of the Holy Alliance. He added, in conclusion: "You should prove to France that you have not guaranteed to Germany the possession of Alsace-Lorraine, nor to Austria that of Trieste and the Trentino. Then only may you hope to conclude a treaty of commerce; meanwhile, you must all think France very simple in imagining that she will supply us with arms against herself." Signor Crispi replied by throwing upon France the warfare of tariffs, and this habitual argument, always well received, carried the majority with him. In like manner, Signor Cavallini's interpellation on the Catholic Congresses, which were being held at this moment at Madrid and Vienna, was turned to the advantage of the Ministry. Signor Crispi was able to show, without difficulty, that foreign Governments, far from supporting these manifestations, had declared that, in their opinion, the Roman question was essentially an Italian one.

These Parliamentary successes could not alleviate the sufferings of the agricultural population. In Lombardy, the *Contadini*, fallen to the lowest depths of want, had allowed them-

selves to be persuaded to take part in tumultuous gatherings and robberies. A riot occurred (May 16) at Ledriano, and it was found necessary to send troops thither from Gallarate and Magenta. On the following day, Ledriano, a large village near Milan, and Baggio (May 18), were the scenes of serious disorder. The houses of the syndic and mayor were sacked and looted, and in the stern reprisals which followed many lives were lost. Such was the condition of Lombardy at the moment when King Humbert and his Prime Minister started for Berlin to return the visit of the German Emperor. On this occasion it was remarked in some quarters that the municipality of Berlin had only voted 150,000 marks for the *fêtes*, whilst the City of Rome had spent two millions in its reception of the Kaiser. But these complaints were lost amid the popular enthusiasm. Signor Bianchi took advantage of the occasion to question the Government on the disorders arising out of the agricultural crisis in Upper Italy. In the absence of Signor Crispi, the Under-Secretary of State for the Interior, Signor Fortis, declared himself responsible for the maintenance of order, and the result fulfilled his promise. On the King's return grand *fêtes* were organised at Milan and elsewhere, but beyond giving to the democratic clubs of Milan and Bologna the opportunity of friendly demonstrations to the French Consuls, they were unimportant.

A few days later, the unexpected news of the occupation of Karen and Asmaura by the Italian troops gave rise to a fresh discussion in the Chamber. Signor Crispi explained that the Abyssinian chief, Baramba ras Kafel, who was in command, had aroused distrust by his course of action, and that in consequence he had been arrested, and his soldiers disarmed. An Italian garrison had occupied the post, and a few days later (June 5) Asmaura had been occupied by the expeditionary force.

The discussion of the Budget was continued, and concluded without noteworthy incident; the Government majority was larger than ever, and the ex-Minister of Finance, Signor Magliani, who was better able than any one else to indicate the weak points of the financial situation, took but little part in the debate. The total receipts of the year ended 30th June, 1889, were estimated at 1,801,397,772 lire, of which 1,615,130,511 lire were counted as ordinary receipts. The expenditure amounted to 1,857,906,850 lire, of which 1,573,557,084 lire appeared as ordinary expenses. There was thus a deficit of about 56 millions and a half of lire (2,260,000*l.*) For the first time since 1887 the Italian exchequer thus found itself forced to recognise officially that its requirements exceeded its resources. It is, therefore, important to examine more closely the details of this ominous Budget. By a comparison between the anticipations for the financial year, 1889-90, with the actual figures of 1880, it will be seen that in ten years the product of direct taxation had risen from 360

to 404 millions; the stamp duties and taxes on business, from 152 to 227 millions, and upon articles of consumption, from 447 to 632. Since 1880, the days of fat kine, when the Budget showed an excess of 50 millions, the grist tax, which brought in 59 millions in that year, had been suppressed; nevertheless, in spite of this deduction, indirect taxation was anticipated to produce 185 millions more. The two largest items under this head were the salt monopoly, estimated at 189 millions (79 millions more than in 1880), and the customs duties, which were valued at 265 millions, as compared with 222. But the increasing poverty of Italy must have had, primarily, the effect of restricting the consumption of genuine tobacco—the only kind paying duty—and the impoverished peasants manufactured artificial tobacco of dried leaves. On the other hand, the war of tariffs with France, and the almost prohibitory duties imposed upon French products, had almost put a stop to trade on the Western frontier, and between Marseilles and the Italian ports.

The expenditure, at the same time, could scarcely fall below the estimates. In the first place, the requirements of the Treasury amounted to 873 millions. The Ministry of War disposed of 256 millions ordinary and 28½ extraordinary. The Navy Department absorbed 107 millions for ordinary and 17 for extraordinary expenses; as a consolation for this huge expenditure, there was only the navy to show. On this service Italy had expended enormous sums, and whilst the cost entailed by the army had not produced results proportionate to the expenditure, the navy had been doubled in five years. In 1884 it numbered 78 ships and 43 torpedo boats, with 457 guns. In 1889 she could put in commission 144 ships, of which some were justly regarded as the most formidable afloat; and in addition to these she possessed 123 torpedo boats, and thus disposed of a force amounting to 1,640 guns.

The Parliamentary recess was marked by two events, which, however different in themselves, had an obvious connection with one another. During the journey made in the month of August by the King through the sixteen provinces of the kingdom, the mission dispatched by Menelek, King of Shoa, arrived at Naples, in order to solicit the King of Italy to take that portion of Ethiopia under his protectorate. Whilst the official world was occupied in offering *fêtes*, not unmarked by doubts and misgivings, to the striking members of Mokean's Embassy, the business-world was suddenly thrown into confusion by the unexpected collapse of the Tiberina Bank. A regular panic ensued, and for a moment it was feared lest the market for Italian securities should have to suspend its transactions. The Ministry appealed to the National Bank to come to the assistance of the Roman Credit Company, and to furnish it with the necessary funds for carrying out its contracts for public works in Rome and elsewhere. The Council of Administration of the Bank was, accord-

ingly, called together (Sept. 5), and by 46 votes to 1 approved the arrangement suggested by the Ministry to prevent the ruin of the *Banca Tiberina*. This gave a slight respite, but the situation was still serious: Milan and Turin were still staggering under a financial crisis, and the rural population suffering seriously. In such moments acts of fanaticism are not uncommon, and Signor Crispi, denounced by the journals of the Opposition as responsible for the state of affairs, almost fell a victim (Sept. 15), being attacked in his carriage by a working-man named Caporali; luckily, this savage assault had no serious results, and the Minister escaped with a few bruises.

The visit of the Emperor of Germany on his way to Athens, and again on his return, was additional evidence of the value attached to the Italian alliance; but even this was to some extent thrown in the shade by Signor Crispi's unexpected speech at Palermo. The President of the Council then allowed it to be understood that he was fully prepared to adopt the new line of policy with regard to France, provided always that that country was disposed to give the necessary guarantees of permanent good-will.

Political life, which during the summer had been partially suspended, revived with the approach of the Municipal Elections; these had more than ordinary importance, inasmuch as they were being held for the first time under the new law, which had considerably modified the municipal franchise. Public attention was chiefly centred in the elections of Naples and Rome. At Naples the outgoing municipality had exposed itself to serious charges of peculation, and at Rome the Duke Torlonia's party, which had been suspended by the Government, appealed to the electors. The absolute expression of their opinion, however, was in some degree obscured by the abstention of the Catholics, whom the Pope had forbidden to take part in the voting at Rome, only 16,889 coming to the poll, out of a total of 45,563 electors. The Duke Torlonia's list was carried by a considerable majority, and a challenge was thus thrown down to the Government.

The re-assembling of the Chambers was marked by more than usual ceremonial (Nov. 25). The King, accompanied by members of the Royal family, was present, and by his speech produced the belief that differential duties would shortly be abolished. The autumn session was almost wholly occupied by the discussion of economical questions, with the view of reorganising at home the credit of the Government. A Bill was brought forward regulating and establishing banks of issue. Hitherto the privilege of issuing bank notes had been limited to six bodies, and the legal limit of bank notes in circulation had been fixed at 1,050 millions of lire.

To remove all temptation of exceeding this maximum, the Government proposed that the State alone should have the right to issue notes, and should furnish its notes to the various

banks; such banks as continued to put in circulation their own paper-money were to lose the privileges they had hitherto enjoyed.

A question of still greater importance occupied the attention of the Chamber during the last weeks of the year. Signor Seismit-Doda, Minister of Finance, and Signor Micelli, Minister of Commerce and Agriculture, presented a report on the losses consequent to Italy on the tariff war. French imports into Italy before the quarrel represented less than 6 per cent. of French external trade, whilst the Italian exports into France amounted to 40 per cent. of the whole external commerce of the former country. Although the trade with Germany showed a considerable development, it was very far from making good the losses on the side of France, especially as the exports to that country were out of all proportion to the imports from it. This displacement of the course of trade had not, as was hoped, brought about the corresponding augmentation of Italian trade with the manufacturing centres of Europe. "Italy," said the report, "demands the cessation of the tariff warfare, in order that national labour should resume its normal channel, and in order that it may not suffer later on from those economical disturbances which are the result of an artificial system."

The debate (Dec. 20) arising on this report was prolonged and keen. Signor Crispi, in reply to a question on the Latin Monetary Union, declared that, far from denouncing it, he would do all in his power to have it prolonged, regarding it as important to Italian interests. Signor Ellena, the author of the General Tariff of 1887, argued that France, having been the aggressor, it was for her to make the first advances, and that Italy should not abrogate her differential tariff without the assurance of definite concessions. The Chamber, however, supported the Government, and by a very large majority voted the suppression of differential rates.

If the struggle between France and Italy seemed to be passing into a less acute stage, the situation of the Papacy was becoming more unsatisfactory. Leo XIII. continued to discuss openly the idea of quitting Rome, and launched several Encyclical letters on the necessity of restoring the temporal power, and had once more formally forbidden Catholics to take part in the Roman elections. To these protests the Government replied by an act of exceptional import: they asked (Dec. 14) the Chamber to pass a Bill on charitable funds, which for some months had been under consideration: by this Bill it was proposed to transfer from the ecclesiastical bodies the disposal of all funds having charitable objects, and to transfer the administration of the property of the charities to the State. No greater blow could be imagined to the influence of the clergy, who relied for their popularity on the alms or doles at their disposal, and it is not surprising that at the Christmas reception of the Cardinals Pope Leo XIII. should bitterly resent this fresh attack upon his power.

CHAPTER II.

I. GERMANY.

THE first important political incident of the year was the acquittal of Dr. Geffcken on the charge of treason in consequence of the publication by him, in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, of part of the Diary of the late Emperor Frederick (Annual Register, 1888, p. 276). The judgment of the Imperial Court at Leipzig stated that the preliminary inquiry against Dr. Geffcken had, indeed, shown ground for the suspicion that he had published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* information, the concealment of which from other Governments was in the interest of the German Empire, but that there is not adequate reason to believe that Dr. Geffcken was aware that the information contained in the article was of that nature. Accordingly, the Tribunal decreed, first, that the proceedings against Dr. Geffcken for treason to the State must be abandoned; secondly, that he must be set at liberty; and thirdly, that the Imperial Treasury must defray the whole of the costs of the inquiry.

On Jan. 16 the *Government Messenger* published the text of the indictment against Professor Geffcken, with other important documents bearing on the case. The first was the following Order, addressed by the Emperor to the Chancellor, dated Berlin, Jan. 13, 1889:—

"In reply to your report of the 13th instant, I charge you to send to the Federal Governments and to the *Reichsanzeiger* the official communications requisite to enable the Governments and the subjects of the Empire to form an opinion for themselves as to how the Imperial administration of justice has been conducted in the inquiry against Professor Dr. Geffcken. For this purpose I command that the accusation against Dr. Geffcken be published in the *Reichsanzeiger*, and communicated to the Federal Council, along with the documents belonging to it, in order that they may be used in the manner indicated by your report.

(Signed) "WILHELM II."

The Chancellor's report, to which this order referred, is as follows:—

"Respectfully referring to my direct report of the 23rd Sept. last, I most humbly take the liberty of laying before your Majesty the resolution of the Imperial tribunal of the 4th instant in regard to the criminal charge against the Privy Councillor of Justice, Dr. Geffcken. This resolution shows that the tribunal acknowledges that, according to the result of the preliminary inquiry, there were sufficient grounds for the suspicion that the accused had published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* information which ought to have been kept secret from other Governments,

in the interest of the German Empire. The proceedings against the accused, however, have been dropped, because in the opinion of the tribunal there were no sufficient reasons for believing that he was aware of the criminality of his action. My humble report of the 23rd of September was caused by the fact that the publication of the late Emperor Frederick's Diary—of which at that time the source was unknown—was made use of by a large part of the press at home and abroad for the purpose of misrepresentations, by which the pernicious effect of that illicit publication on the Empire and the Royal House was materially enhanced. Similar misrepresentations of the facts and legal proceedings, as also of the reasons why the latter were instituted and dropped, are now being made in the German and foreign press hostile to the Empire, and are turned to account with a view to throwing suspicion on the impartiality and authority of the Imperial administration of justice in the Empire. These falsifications aim at representing the proceedings of the Public Prosecutor of the Empire and of the Imperial tribunal as being partial, and inspired by a desire of persecution. It is, therefore, necessary in the interest of your Majesty's administration of justice in the Empire to render it possible—first, for the allied Governments, and secondly, for the subjects of the Empire, to form an independent judgment upon these proceedings, not falsified by the anti-Imperial press. This can only be done by publishing all the documents by which the resolutions of the Imperial Prosecutor and of the Imperial tribunal were determined, and making them known to all persons interested in seeing that the conduct of the organs of justice in the Empire is everywhere just and proper. This object would, in my humble opinion, be attained if your Majesty would be pleased to issue an order for the publication of the indictment in the *Reichsanzeiger*, and for the communication to the allied Governments, through the medium of the Federal Council, this my humble report, and along with it all the documents on which the accusation against Professor Geffcken is founded, with a view to their further use, as indicated above. Should your Majesty agree with this view, I would humbly leave it to your Majesty graciously to sign the enclosed Draft Order.

(Signed) "VON BISMARCK."

The publication of these documents was followed almost immediately by the resignation (Jan. 17) of Dr. Friedberg, Minister of Justice. It was during his tenure of office that Dr. Geffcken was arrested, and shortly before the end of the previous year orders had been given for the prosecution of Herr Richter's *Freisinnige Zeitung* for a similar offence; but the prosecution was ultimately abandoned. The resignation of the Minister was generally attributed to these two abortive prosecutions. His successor was Herr von Schelling, Secretary in the Department

of Justice, son of the famous German philosopher, and a very learned jurist.

The Prussian Diet had an unusually short and insignificant session, owing, it was said, to the impossibility of passing a Bill for reforms in the levying of the income-tax which had been announced in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Diet. In the German Parliament, on the other hand, two important measures finally became law. The chief of these was the Aged and Indigent Workmen's Insurance Bill, the first reading of which had been passed in the previous year, and which was finally accepted only by a majority of 20 (May 24); and the other was a proposal brought forward by the clerical party for the abrogation of the Imperial law of 1874, under which clergymen who have been deprived of their livings by the State, and continue to officiate, may be expelled from the country. The latter measure was passed almost unanimously, in view, it was said, of the approaching elections, as it was desired to deprive the clergy of a subject of effective agitation at the polls. The following is a description of the new law for labour insurance, in the shape in which it was ultimately adopted by the House:—

The law aims at providing every labourer, workman, or servant in the Empire, with some material assistance when rendered unable to earn his living owing to mental or bodily infirmity, or as soon as he has reached the age of seventy; and it is calculated that about 11,000,000 persons will come within the scope of the Act. The State has undertaken to contribute a large portion of the sums required to meet the allowances, which, it is estimated, will eventually amount to 12,520,000*l.* per annum, with 600,000*l.* per annum in addition as the costs of administration. Objections were taken to this State subsidy while the Bill was under discussion, because, on the one hand, it introduced a dangerous Socialist principle, which would deprive the measure of much of its virtue by giving it a pauperising tendency; and, on the other hand, because the sums which would have to be raised to meet it would in all probability lead to additional indirect taxation, the burden of which, falling principally upon the poorer classes, would render the State subsidy a bane to them rather than a blessing. The Government, however, considered that the money could never be raised by direct contributions, more especially as the scheme was taken out of the ordinary commercial category by the decision to grant allowances for old age immediately on the Act coming into force, and those for infirmity at the expiration of one year from that date. As it was also imperative to form a sinking fund, a State subsidy became *ipso facto* a necessity. The principle was, therefore, admitted, and the amount of the State contribution was fixed at 2*l.* 10*s.* yearly for every allowance. It was reckoned that the State subsidy would amount to 320,000*l.* the first year, and gradually rise till it reached 3,450,000*l.* in the eightieth year of insurance, when it

was supposed that an approximate balance would, for the first time, be established between the number of allowances to be paid and the amount of capital collected to meet insurance liabilities, and that the State subsidy, being no longer necessary, would be gradually extinguished.

Under the new Act it is obligatory upon all persons to be insured upon completing the sixteenth year of their life who—

1. Are employed as workmen, assistants, apprentices, or servants, and receive for their service a payment or wage.

2. Are engaged in business as assistants in shops and apprentices (excepting assistants and apprentices of apothecaries), and are in receipt of payment or wage, but whose regular yearly earnings do not exceed 100*l.* And—

3. Persons employed for payment or wage as members of the crews, &c., of German ships, whether for sea or for inland navigation.

The provisions may also be extended to persons who do not employ regularly at least one paid workman, or small masters who are employed by others. Officials in the service of the State, and persons serving as soldiers who are also employed as servants, are not liable to compulsory insurance. The insured have been divided into four wage-classes, as follows:—Class 1, Yearly wages up to 17*l.* 10*s.*; Class 2, Yearly wages up to 27*l.* 10*s.*; Class 3, Yearly wages up to 42*l.* 10*s.*; Class 4, Yearly wages over 42*l.* 10*s.*

The contributions payable by employer and insured together in equal shares are fixed for the first ten years after the law comes into force at:—Class 1, 14 pf. weekly (or 1½*d.*); Class 2, 20 pf. weekly (or 2½*d.*); Class 3, 24 pf. weekly (or 3*d.*); Class 4, 30 pf. weekly (or 3¾*d.*)

These rates of contribution were calculated to be sufficient to meet all necessary expenditure during the first ten years, even under the most adverse conditions; after that period they were to be settled anew every five years, according to circumstances. It was also reckoned that the highest rate of contributions after eighty years' time, when the equilibrium would be reached and the State subsidy discontinued, will not exceed 2½*d.* per week for the first class, and 8*d.* for the fourth (half being paid by the employer and half by the insured).

Every person is entitled to an allowance for infirmity, without taking his age into account, who has become confirmedly unfit for work. A man may be considered as unfit when, in consequence of his bodily or mental condition, he is not in a position to earn by means of labour, paid in a manner corresponding to his powers and capabilities, a sum which amounts to at least one-sixth of the average standard of wages according to which contributions have been paid for him during the previous five contributory years. Every insured person is entitled to an allowance for old age, without necessarily proving that he is incap-

able of work, who has completed the seventieth year of his life. The insured who, without being confirmed invalids, are unfit for work during an entire year, are also entitled to receive an allowance for infirmity during the further continuation of their inability to work. Such insured persons as have brought upon themselves—either purposely or by committing any criminal action, declared as such by a court of law—a condition of unfitness to work, have no claim to an allowance for infirmity.

In order to become entitled to an infirm allowance, it is necessary to have paid contributions during five contributory years—except as regards cases of infirmity setting in within the first five years, but after the first year subsequent to the Act coming into force—for which cases special provision is made. Forty-seven weekly contributions are reckoned as completing the contributory year, this diminution on the calendar year being made in favour of persons who cannot be in regular employment throughout the year. The infirm allowances range, after five contributory years, from 5*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.* per annum in the lowest wage class, to 7*l.* 0*s.* 2*d.* in the highest; and after fifty contributory years, from 7*l.* 17*s.* in the lowest class, to 20*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* in the highest.

A period of thirty contributory years, equal to 1,410 contributory weeks, is prescribed for the attainment of an age allowance, the payments in the several classes being as follows:—Class 1, 5*l.* 6*s.* 5*d.*; Class 2, 6*l.* 14*s.* 7*d.*; Class 3, 8*l.* 2*s.* 10*d.*; Class 4, 9*l.* 11*s.*

It was suggested that the contributions should be raised, in order to make the annuities somewhat more substantial; but the Government decided that it would be better to proceed cautiously at first, so as not to impose too heavy a burden on the labouring classes at the start. It was also pointed out that the lowest allowance for old age—5*l.* 6*s.* 5*d.*—is equivalent to more than a third of the yearly average earnings of the wage class for which such allowance is granted, and that the Act never aimed at providing the aged and incapacitated with sufficient means to enable them to live independently, but that these allowances should rather be considered as an addition to whatever means of subsistence the pensioner may otherwise possess. In the case of an insured person dying before coming into the receipt of an allowance, the part which was deducted from his wages may be restored to his widow and orphans. A woman on marrying may also claim the restitution of her payments.

The difficulty of collecting the minute contributions of eleven million persons weekly was very simply solved. Four kinds of stamps, corresponding in value to the different contributions of the four wage classes, were issued. The employer, who must purchase these stamps beforehand, will on each pay-day deduct one-half of the contributions for the previous week from the wages of the insured in his employ (the other half being payable

by himself), and then paste an insurance stamp, corresponding in value to the full contribution, on to the receipt card of the insured. These receipt cards contain forty-seven spaces—the number of weeks of the contributory year. The cards, duly numbered and dated, are collected and stored away, so that each person's contributions can be easily traced back. The payment of allowances is effected, in an equally simple way, through the instrumentality of the postal authorities.

Insurance Institutes are to be established throughout the Empire for the administration and execution of the provisions of the Act. Everything was done to reduce the expenses to a minimum, and it was of immense advantage in this respect that the services both of the Postal Administration and of the lower administrative authorities were secured to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Act. The costs of administration were calculated at 1s. per head, or 600,000*l.* per annum.

All already-existing benefit and insurance funds, whether simply local or for trades or Government services, were left untouched by this law, which officially recognised their existence, and relieved their members of compulsory insurance, provided that the regulations of such funds met certain conditions; while the Act was to work conjointly with these funds as regards persons insured at one time with them and at another under its own provisions.

Some serious strikes took place in May and during the rest of the year, especially among the coal miners in Silesia, in Westphalia, and in Saxony. The Emperor showed great interest in these strikes, visiting the disturbed districts, and endeavouring by his personal intervention and that of the leading officials to bring about arrangements between the workmen and their employers.

In November, a Bill for introducing permanent enactments against the Socialists, instead of, as hitherto, renewing them from time to time, and for giving the Government power to expel Socialist agitators, was introduced in the House, but the debates upon it had not concluded at the end of the year. The Bill was strongly opposed on all sides of the House, and the Socialist Deputy, Herr Liebknecht, made a strong speech against it, in which he admitted that, as a young party, they had formerly committed several over-hasty acts; but added that they had been constantly becoming more practical, especially since they had been able to send their own representatives to Parliament. He maintained that his party was the best organised of any. They could, if they were so minded, do all that the Russian Nihilists had done, and destroy all the authors of the Socialist Act; but they had not done so, precisely because they were not demagogues or Nihilists, but were the party of organised progress. He further referred to the fact that the Emperor, at an interview with the Westphalian workmen, had declared to them that, if

they did not obey orders, he would have them all shot down—a reference which drew down upon the speaker a call to order from the President. Herr Liebknecht then pointed out that a strike in England took a course quite different from that in Germany, because nobody feared the strikers there; whereas people in Germany were frightened of them, though the strikers confined themselves just as strictly within legal limits as in England. "We know well," he added, "that we can do nothing by force, but that circumstances must develop themselves organically. We are against force; it is you who are for it, for the means by which you have joined Germany together are blood and iron." He concluded by predicting for Germany a new and greater Jena disaster than in 1806 if she continued to shut her eyes to the spirit of the new age.

The Imperial Budget presented to the Reichstag was balanced at 1,208,664,739 marks. Of the expenditure, the sum of 849,614,835 marks figured as permanent, and 81,849,597 as non-recurring expenditure, in the ordinary estimates, and 277,700,307 marks as non-recurring expenditure in the extraordinary Budget.

In the ordinary army estimates, the sum of 6,629,000 marks was added to the permanent expenditure, 1,500,000 marks of this amount being devoted to the creation of the two new army corps. The extraordinary army estimates amounted to 139,500,000 marks, of which sum 45,750,000 marks was for the charges necessitated by the extension of the obligation of military service, and 61,250,000 marks for the artillery.

The permanent annual expenditure for the navy was increased by 2,500,000 marks, and the ordinary naval estimates included an additional sum of about 34,000,000 marks, part of which was to be devoted to the construction of a new despatch vessel, to take the place of the *Hohenzollern*. The total addition to the army charges was 146,000,000 marks, and to the naval estimates about 36,000,000 marks.

In the non-recurring expenditure for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, provision was made for an additional sum of 166,800 marks for increasing the police forces in the German South-West African Protectorate, and supplementary estimates were promised for East Africa.

Colonial questions, which of late had become more and more prominent in German politics, were this year again the cause of much anxiety and labour in the Berlin Foreign Office. The longest and most interesting speech of the Parliamentary session was unquestionably that of Prince Bismarck (who on other occasions was unusually silent) on the East African Bill. This Bill, which was introduced on January 15, asked for the grant of a sum not exceeding 2,000,000 marks to be expended in proportion to the requirements of the Government, and proposed to grant powers to an Imperial Commissioner (Captain Wissmann :

to superintend in the name of the Chancellor the German East African Company and its *employés*.

After some preliminary skirmishing with Herr Richter, Dr. Bamberger, and other members of the Liberalist party, Prince Bismarck rose to address the House. "The last speaker," he said, "certainly casts upon the Imperial Chancellor a heavy responsibility, which he assuredly cannot undertake in so far as regards all that happens in Eastern Africa. This must be left to the officials whom we have established there to settle things. I will tell the Reichstag honestly how far I intend to go, and I will not go a hair's-breadth further. What I propose applies only to the immediate, most pressing requirements. The first speaker touched on the question as to the position which we shall take up with regard to foreign Powers, and on that point I can only say that we have proceeded, and shall ever proceed, solely with, and in agreement with, the greatest colonial Power in the world—England. I deny, therefore, emphatically the suggestion that we have any intention of proceeding against the Sultan of Zanzibar in opposition to the wishes of England. In Zanzibar, and also in Samoa, we are in the fullest accord with England, and advance hand-in-hand with her. We are absolutely resolved to be at one with the English Government, and to uphold that unity. We have shared with the English in Africa, and the only unpleasantnesses which have arisen have been with subordinate officials, for whom the Government neither can nor will be responsible. We cannot discuss whether Englishmen do exactly the same in their division of Africa as we in ours. It has never occurred to us that we should ask England for any assistance in our own sphere of power, and such a thing is beyond the range of possibility. I cannot recognise the necessity for a discussion of this Bill by a Committee. There is nothing to prevent two hundred members attending the Committee, and I could just as well say to a full House what I might have to say to such a Committee. Time gained in this question is not only money, but blood, gained. Besides, no information could be given to a Committee about the details of our plans, about the force to be enrolled, or their arms and ammunition, for fear of making our foe acquainted with them. The measures taken hitherto have thoroughly stood the test, and justify us in further building on them. The blockade has had less a military than a political significance. The chief thing was to prove to the natives the unity existing between Germany and England and the other European Powers. If rivalry exists, neither of the two Powers will have or retain that halo of prestige which is necessary in order to impress the blacks. We must, therefore, hold unreservedly to our understanding with the British Government. We have concluded no treaties with England, but we can regard her as an old and historical ally, with whom we have been in touch for a hundred and fifty years, even in colonial questions."

Prince Bismarck then adverted to some criticisms of Herr Bamberger, who had taunted him with having changed his views on colonial policy. He read some passages from his speeches delivered in 1885, and declared that he had departed from the opinions therein expressed. His present action was dictated solely by the immediate circumstances. "For the sake of two million marks, or for Zanzibar," the Chancellor continued, "I cannot throw myself against the great impulse of the nation, or offer opposition to the will of the whole country. To this day I am not a 'colonies man,' and I entertain the gravest apprehensions on the subject; but I was compelled to decide upon yielding to the general demand of the nation. I would venture to advise Herr Bamberger to follow my example in this respect. I ask the assent of the lawful Assembly of the Empire to my action. If it repudiates my action, I can only admit that I have been mistaken. I shall then give up all further plans. The coast territory has been acquired by a German company. It is, at all events, very important, and must be retained. I cannot burden myself with the reproach of posterity that I failed to protect Germans and German possessions. Not in three weeks, in three months—no, nor in three years, can one look for results; but perhaps in thirty years' time people may bitterly rue the neglect of to-day. If the locomotive of the Empire has struck out a track for itself, I shall not be the one to throw stones in its way."

The Chancellor next alluded to Herr Bamberger's remarks concerning South-West Africa. He could inform that hon. deputy, who had, by his recent speech, already done considerable financial hurt to the West African colonies, and who valued the titles of his compatriots in those regions at so low a rate, that for those same worthless claims several millions of marks had been offered by Englishmen to the German holders. To-day, perhaps, after Herr Bamberger's depreciatory remarks, they might be willing to give only another million. Returning, then, to the Bill before the House, Prince Bismarck said that it was not a question of the East African Company, but of civilisation. They must keep their eyes fixed on the suppression of the slave trade, and must, therefore, obtain control over that traffic. A further task before them was the utilisation of the fertile strip of the East African coast for the laying out of plantations. That offered really promising prospects. If Germany, who yearly spent five hundred million marks on coffee, wool, tobacco, &c., could save only the tenth, or even the twentieth, part of that sum by the production of these articles in East Africa, that would be an additional reason for Germany holding the coast.

The Bill was rapidly passed by the House, and Captain Wissmann proceeded to Egypt (Feb. 16), to enlist soldiers for the force he was to take with him to Zanzibar as Imperial Commissioner. In the instructions he received from Prince Bismarck he was directed to "demand modification of any orders of the East

African Company which might seem of a kind to disturb the natives or infringe the treaty rights of other European nations." "If," continued the Prince, "your demands are not complied with, you can temporarily suspend the orders objected to by your veto. You are also entitled, in urgent cases, to dismiss officials of the Company in the interests of amity and of good relations with the natives." Meanwhile, news arrived of an Arab attack on the German mission station at Tugu (Jan. 13), which resulted in the massacre of three missionaries and two ladies at the mission, and the capture of another lady and two missionaries. It was believed that this was an act of revenge for the bombardment of the coast villages by the German war-vessels, and, also, that one of the objects of the attack was to recapture 200 liberated slaves who had been placed under the protection of the mission. The German operations began (March 3) with a naval attack on Bagamoyo, the stronghold of the African chief, Bushiri. The Germans landed, and marched on the town, upon which the natives fled, leaving behind them two Krupp guns which they had captured from the German East African Company. The Germans then occupied the town, and destroyed some of the neighbouring villages; but Bushiri and his men still remained in the vicinity, and when Captain Wissmann arrived (March 31) he at once prepared to attack them. On May 8 he stormed Bushiri's fortified camp with 700 blacks and 200 German marines. Bushiri himself escaped, but his force of 600 men was dispersed, leaving 80 killed and 20 prisoners on the field. On June 6 Captain Wissmann captured and burnt two other towns on the coast—Saadani and Uwindi. On July 8 he occupied Pagani, the natives withdrawing into the interior; and on July 10 he bombarded Tanga. On Sept. 13 his military police made a reconnaissance of the coast between Bagamoyo and Dur-es-Salam, and took and destroyed Kondutchi, a small port, the inhabitants of which had supplied the insurgent Arabs with ammunition and provisions. More fighting with Bushiri took place in October and November, and he was finally captured and executed at Pagani (Dec. 15).

The proximity of the English settlements in Africa to those of Germany gave rise to some differences between the two countries. At Lamu, in East Africa, the British East African Company claimed a right to levy duties, on the ground that such right had been conferred upon them by the existing Sultan of Zanzibar; while the German Company declared that it had been given this privilege by his predecessor. The question was submitted to arbitration, and the arbitrator, Baron Lambertont, a Belgian Minister, gave his award in favour of England (Aug. 18). In July considerable excitement was produced in Germany by the news that Admiral Fremantle, the officer in command of the English blockading squadron, had ordered the seizure of the *Neera*, a German ship belonging to Dr. Peters'

expedition for the relief of Emin Pasha, on the ground that it had attempted to break the blockade by landing arms and ammunition. In October it was announced by the *Official Gazette* that the whole of the coast between the German colony of Vitu and Kismaju had been placed under the protection of Germany—an announcement which called forth a protest from the British Government, on the ground that a portion of the territory in question already belonged to the British Company. In South-west Africa difficulties also occurred between Germany and England on account of the arrest by the German Imperial Commissioner of two Englishmen in the service of Mr. Lewis at Otymbuige for endeavouring to incite the natives against the German protectorate.

The Samoan question, which at the end of the year 1888 was very threatening (*see* ANNUAL REGISTER, 1888, p. 284), at length became so critical that it was found necessary to settle it by a conference. In January the United States Government sent Admiral Kimberley with a naval squadron to the island to protect the interests of the American residents, but the fear that this might produce a collision between the United States and Germany proved unfounded. On Jan. 13 Prince Bismarck announced to the German representatives in London and Washington that he had received telegraphic intelligence from Africa to the effect that a detachment of German marines had been attacked by a number of Samoans in the service of the chief Mataafa; that this unprovoked attack had been carried out under the orders of an American named Klein, and that in the fight which ensued more than fifty German officers and soldiers had been killed and wounded. The Prince further stated that military operations had consequently become necessary for the punishment of the murderers and the protection of the German settlers and their property, but that every care would be taken not to injure the property of neutrals, and to respect the conventions made with England and the United States in regard to Samoa. Shortly after the date of this despatch the German authorities declared war in the name of the Emperor against Mataafa; they also suppressed the *Samoa Times*, proclaimed martial law, placed the police in Apia under German control, and notified their intention of searching all vessels for contraband of war. These measures, however, were not approved by Prince Bismarck, and the United States Government strongly protested against them. Dr. Knappe, the German Consul, was accordingly removed from his post as chief administrator of Samoa, and the military commander was directed not to apply his proclamation of martial law to the foreigners in the island. At the beginning of February Prince Bismarck proposed to the United States Government that the Conference on the Samoan question held at Washington in 1887 should be continued at Berlin. The proposal was accepted, and the date fixed for the meeting of the Conference was May 1.

Meanwhile (March 16) a terrible disaster occurred during a hurricane off the coast of Samoa. Two German ships of war, the *Eber* and the *Adler*, were lost with all on board, and a third, the *Olga*, was so damaged as to be useless. The only ship of the international squadron which was saved was the British vessel *Calliope*, which owed its escape to the skill and bravery of its commander and crew. The Conference sat from May 1 to June 14, when a treaty was signed by the representatives of Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. The following is a summary of the chief provisions of the treaty :—

Article 1 declares that the islands of Samoa are neutral territory, in which the citizens and subjects of the three signatory Powers have equal rights of residence, trade, and personal protection. The three Powers recognise the independence of the Samoan Government and the free right of the natives to elect the chief or king and choose their form of government according to their own laws and customs. None of the Powers shall exercise any separate control over the islands or the government thereof. It is further declared, with a view to the prompt restoration of peace and good order in the islands, and in view of the difficulties which would surround an election in the present disordered condition of their government, that Malietoa Laupepa, who was formally made and appointed king on July 12, 1881, and was so recognised by the three Powers, shall again be so recognised hereafter in the exercise of such authority, unless the three Powers shall, by common accord, otherwise declare; and that his successor shall be duly elected according to the laws and customs of Samoa.

Article 2 declares that in every case where the provisions of this Act shall be inconsistent with any provision of a previous treaty or treaties the provisions of the Act shall prevail. By Article 3 it is agreed that a Supreme Court shall be established in Samoa, to consist of one judge, who shall be styled Chief Justice of Samoa, and who shall appoint a clerk and a marshal of the Court. With a view to secure judicial independence and the equal consideration of the rights of all parties, irrespective of nationality, it is agreed that the Chief Justice shall be named by the three signatory Powers in common accord, or, failing their agreement, he may be named by the King of Sweden and Norway. He shall be learned in law and equity, of mature years, and of good renown for his sense of honour, impartiality, and justice. His decision upon questions within his jurisdiction shall be final; he shall be appointed by the Samoan Government upon the certificate of his nomination as herein provided, and receive an annual salary of \$6,000; but, on proper cause shown, he may be removed if in conflict with the Government, and the signatory Governments will accept and abide by such decision. In case any difference shall arise between either of the Treaty Powers and Samoa which they shall fail to adjust by mutual

accord, such difference shall not be held cause for war, but shall be referred for adjustment, on the principles of justice and equity, to the Chief Justice of Samoa, who shall make his decision thereon in writing. Upon the organisation of the Supreme Court there shall be transferred to its exclusive jurisdiction—(1) all civil suits concerning real property situated in Samoa, and all rights affecting the same; (2) all civil suits of any kind between natives and foreigners or between foreigners of different nationalities; (3) all crimes and offences committed by natives against foreigners or committed by such foreigners as are not subject to any consular jurisdiction.

In order that the native Samoans may keep their lands for cultivation by themselves and by their children after them, it is declared by Article 4 that all future alienation of lands in the islands of Samoa to the citizens or subjects of any foreign country, whether by sale, mortgage, or otherwise, shall be prohibited, subject to certain specified exceptions. In order to adjust and settle all claims by aliens of titles to land or any interest therein in the islands of Samoa, it is declared that a Commission of Inquiry shall be appointed, to consist of three impartial and competent persons, one to be named by each of the three Treaty Powers, to be assisted by an officer to be styled "Natives' Advocate," who shall be appointed by the Chief Executive of Samoa, with the approval of the Chief Justice of Samoa. The labours of the Commission, which are described in great detail, shall be closed in two years, or sooner if practicable.

Article 5 is a declaration respecting the municipal district of Apia, providing a local administration therefor, and defining the jurisdiction of the municipal magistrate.

Article 6 deals with taxation and revenue in Samoa. The port of Apia shall be the port of entry for all dutiable goods arriving in the Samoan islands, and all foreign goods, wares, and merchandise landed on the islands shall be there entered for examination; but coal and naval stores which either Government has by treaty reserved the right to land at any harbour stipulated for that purpose are not dutiable when imported as authorised by such treaty, and may be there landed as stipulated without such entry or examination. To enable the Samoan Government to obtain the necessary revenue for the maintenance of government and good order in the islands certain specified duties, taxes, and charges may be levied and collected, without prejudice to the right of the native Government to levy and collect other taxes at its discretion upon the natives of the islands and their property, and with the consent of the Consuls of the signatory Powers upon all property outside the municipal district, provided such taxes shall bear uniformly upon the same class of property, whether owned by natives or foreigners.

Article 7 deals with arms and ammunition and intoxicating

liquors, restraining their sale and use. The importation into the islands of Samoa of arms and ammunition by the natives of Samoa or by the citizens or subjects of any foreign country shall be prohibited, except in certain specified cases. The sale of arms and ammunition by any foreigner to any native Samoan subject or other Pacific Islander resident in Samoa is also prohibited. Any arms or ammunition imported or sold in violation of these provisions shall be forfeited to the Government of Samoa. The Samoan Government retains the right to import suitable arms and ammunition to protect itself and maintain order; but all such arms and ammunition shall be entered at the Customs without payment of duty, and reported by the President of the Municipal Council to the Consuls of the three treaty Powers. No spirituous, vinous, or fermented liquors or intoxicating drinks whatever shall be sold, given, or offered to any native Samoan or South Sea Islander resident in Samoa to be taken as a beverage, under adequate penalties, including imprisonment.

The provisions of this Act are to continue in force until changed by consent of the three Powers upon the request of either Power. After three years from the signature thereof, the Powers are to consider by common accord what ameliorations, if any, may be introduced into the provisions of the General Act. In the meantime any special amendment may be adopted by the consent of the three Powers, with the adherence of Samoa.

In February an incident occurred which produced much ill-feeling between Germany and France, but owing to the tact of the French Government did not have any serious consequences. Colonel Senart, of the 90th regiment, issued an order of the day in which he announced that Dr. Eudes, the chief regimental surgeon, having applied to the German authorities for leave to visit his sick mother at Strasburg, the required permission was granted by the police of that town, but was refused by a higher authority, and that the sick mother died shortly after. The Colonel stigmatized this proceeding as unworthy of a civilised country, and directed that the order should be read to each company at general muster, and that the officers "should comment on it to their men in order to impress on their hearts the feelings which every French soldier should entertain towards Germany." M. de Freycinet, the Minister of War, at once directed the Colonel to be reprimanded, and the incident had no further result.

On May 24, King Humbert of Italy paid a visit with his Prime Minister, Signor Crispi, to the German Emperor at Berlin. Signor Crispi was given a banquet by some leading members of the German Parliament, at which Herr von Benda, in proposing the health of the Italian Premier, described him as "the first and finest pillar of the Italo-German peace alliance, whom we greet to-day in our own name and in that of our faithful ally, Austria-Hungary." Some sensation was also produced by

the arrival in Berlin, with the King, of a number of Italian generals, including the Inspector-general of Artillery and some members of the general staff, who held frequent conferences with the German general staff. Another distinguished visitor to the German capital was the Shah, who arrived at the beginning of June.

A dispute occurred in the middle of June in consequence of the expulsion, by the authorities of the Canton of Aargau, of a German police-officer named Wohlgemuth, who had been sent there to watch the Socialists. A despatch on the subject was addressed to the Swiss Government, on June 13, by Germany, Russia, and Austria, and the views of the German Government on the case were expressed in the following despatch, dated June 5, which was addressed by Prince Bismarck to Herr von Bulow, the German Minister at Berne:—

“We have had to endure for years the grievance that Anarchists and conspirators have dared to set on foot from Switzerland, and without hindrance, their attempts on the domestic peace of the German Empire. The head-centre of the German Social Democrats is located in Switzerland. The members hold their meetings there to discuss and prepare their attacks upon us, and send out from there their agents, and circulate their inflammatory writings, printed in that country, to intensify class hatreds, and to prepare the way for riots in Germany. The worst Anarchist criminals, such as Reinsdorf, Neve, and others, have received their political education in Switzerland, and come straight thence to Germany to execute their murderous projects.

“The German Government have till now refrained from expressing their chief political complaints against these doings, in deference to the relations with Switzerland, and have confined themselves to observing the plots which were being hatched against them. They assumed that it was not illegal for the German police to take precautions everywhere against criminal projects, and that they could rely, if not on the support, at least on the continuance of the goodwill of the authorities of the friendly neighbouring state. This supposition has proved of late to be an error. Swiss Canton officials, such as Captain Fischer in Zürich, have publicly supported the anti-German Revolutionary Party. In the case of Wohlgemuth, this has proceeded so far that the German official, even before he could obtain his instructions, was arrested and expelled from Switzerland after being treated like a criminal for ten days. This conduct on the part of the Swiss authorities is in strong contrast to the way in which the Imperial Government has invariably acted towards Switzerland. It shows that the Swiss Government is, at least, indifferent to the dangers and injuries with which friendly Powers are threatened by the plots directed against them from Switzerland, with the sufferance of the Swiss authorities.

"The German Empire has never shown anything but kindly feelings towards Switzerland, and the Imperial Government would be grieved if it were compelled to put an end to this friendly intercourse. If, however, Switzerland continues to permit the German Revolutionists to threaten the internal peace and the safety of the German Empire, the Imperial Government will be forced, in common with other Powers, to consider how far Swiss neutrality can be reconciled with the assurance of order and peace, without which the other European Powers cannot satisfactorily exist. When the course of events has transgressed essential parts of the Treaty on which the neutrality of Switzerland rests, those of its clauses in favour of Switzerland can only be retained if the obligations implied in them are fulfilled by that country. The other Powers cannot guarantee the neutrality of the union so long as Switzerland does not observe her obligation to prevent their peace and safety being threatened. I desire you to read this communication to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and to send him a copy of it, if desired."

At the meeting of the Federal Assembly at Berne, on June 21, the Federal Council replied to an interpellation on the subject. After narrating the circumstances of the Wohlgemuth affair, the Federal Council expressed regret that it was not informed in good time of his arrest by the authorities of the Canton of Aargau. It added, however, that Switzerland, which had acted within the limits of her sovereignty, cannot tolerate the existence of a foreign police on its territory, nor subordinate a "*permis d'établissement*" in her country to a certificate granted by the German authorities.

In answer to the Collective Note of the three Powers, the Federal Council had stated that it considered that the right of asylum is an attribute belonging to any free country, and has no relation with the principle of neutrality, which is an international right sanctioned by the Powers and freely accepted by Switzerland. It nevertheless recognised that its foreign police was defective; and in order to give satisfaction on this point, it presented to the Assembly the necessary measures to increase the means of watching refugees in Switzerland.

In a further despatch addressed by Prince Bismarck to Herr von Bulow, the former declared that the German Government must maintain its interpretation of the Settlement Treaty of 1876 and of the right of asylum, and reiterated his previous demand regarding the police supervision to be exercised by Switzerland over foreigners in that country. He added that the German Socialists do not enter Switzerland as political refugees, but of their own accord, in order to plot against Germany, and that they have therefore no claim to the right of asylum; and he concluded by expressing a hope that a new treaty might be prepared. On July 24, the German Minister at Berne gave notice to terminate the Settlement Treaty of 1870, and after the negotiations

had proceeded for a short time longer, the matter ultimately dropped.

The hearty reception given to the German Emperor during his visit to England at the beginning of August, and the compliment paid to him by Queen Victoria in appointing him an honorary admiral of the British fleet, greatly pleased the German people, and the German press spoke in enthusiastic language of the efficiency of the military and naval forces of England and her value as an ally. The Prussian army also expressed much gratification at the Queen having been appointed honorary colonel of the Prussian regiment of the 1st Dragoon Guards, of which the Duke of Wellington had been honorary colonel. On his return to Berlin the German Emperor stopped at Strasburg, where he was heartily received. A further occasion for strengthening the friendly relations between Germany and England was afforded by the Emperor's visit to Kiel, where he inspected the British fleet and entertained its officers at a State dinner in the palace, at which he spoke in the highest terms of the efficiency of the British navy.

The antagonism between Germany and Russia, which in the previous year had been very strongly manifested in the press of the two countries, showed no signs of abatement. The increase of the Russian transport duties and the Russian railway tariffs for the carriage of foreign goods naturally produced much irritation in Germany, and the persecution of the German element in the Baltic provinces and in other parts of the Russian Empire increased the hostility which had long existed between the two races. The semi-official German view of the subject was thus expressed in the *Hamburg Correspondent* of Sept. 3:—

"In discussing the incidents of the Emperor William's visit to England and of the Emperor Francis Joseph's visit to Berlin, it was pointed out that with regard to Russia a change of tactics in the direction of the Austro-Hungarian view was about to take place in Germany. Many indications point to the conclusion that people in Berlin can no longer escape the conviction that the Russian policy of Alexander III. is absolutely different from that of Alexander II., and that this change is no transient phenomenon, but is of a permanent nature, so permanent that a return to the older Russian traditions seems out of the question. So long as the hope could be cherished of the victory of the latter over Panslavism, so long as we were permitted to suppose that official Russia was at bottom still attached to the old traditions, and tolerated Panslavism reluctantly, and only so far as the internal conditions of the Czar's Empire appeared to render it necessary, the extremely cautious treatment of Russia, which Prince Bismarck repeatedly advocated in his usual masterly manner in the Reichstag, was in place. So long, too, it was tactically correct to designate France as the only element dangerous to peace in the European family of nations, and, while cautiously

keeping watch for any eventual warlike inclinations on the part of Russia, carefully to avoid everything that could in the least irritate or strengthen the Chauvinism of our Eastern neighbours. For the problem was to strengthen and support official Russia against the urgency of Pan Slavism. This basis of the tactics long adhered to could not but fall to the ground as soon as people were driven to the conviction that it was no longer possible to hold Pan Slavism in check; and this is the conviction which appears now to have been arrived at. It is not to be ignored that the hope of Russia's returning to the traditions of the Emperor Alexander II. must be abandoned, and that Russian Chauvinism has to be reckoned with as an accomplished fact. After this, the basis of the tactics dictating a most delicate and cautious treatment of Russia has ceased to exist. According to an article in the *Post*, it is now necessary to pursue the policy of frankly declaring that the peace of Europe is threatened by Russia even more than by France, and to discuss the means which may be employed against this danger with a prospect of success. At the same time the very questionable idea is broached of giving free scope to Russia's impulses away from Central and Western Europe. It is an open question whether, before Germany's *rapprochement* to Great Britain, discussions of this nature had any other immediately practical purpose than to induce in England an inclination to such a *rapprochement*, and to an active European policy. Now that both these ends have been gained, the discussion of that idea has only a retrospective and academic significance, more especially as our Eastern neighbours are evidently convinced that even with the help of France they are by no means sure of victory, but would encounter a resistance more than a match for them if they should embark on warlike adventures. If it be possible to convince the Russians that they are not likely to meet with anything but defeat on their Western frontiers, the Eastern Chauvinist might learn to wait quietly, conscious of the danger of a new collision with Germany, the more so as the character of the Emperor Alexander III. is averse to risky enterprises. It is indeed just as impossible to calculate the course of events among our Western neighbours. Here, doubtless, lies a great difficulty, and a serious element of uncertainty; but it will be necessary to look facts in the face."

This view was but slightly modified by the Czar's visit to Berlin on Oct. 11. Though the two Emperors showed much cordiality to each other, it soon became evident that the Pan Slavist generals and ministers who were his most trusted counsellors did not approve of the visit, and their dissatisfaction was strengthened when it was announced that the next capital to which the "travelling Emperor" would proceed was Constantinople. While he was being received by the Sultan (Nov. 3), Count Kalnoky, the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary, paid a visit to Prince Bismarck at Friedrichsruhe—a double event

which could not fail to be displeasing to the Russian Court. Count Kalnoky's visit, however, does not appear to have been more significant than in previous years. Though the relations between Germany and Austria-Hungary continued to be of the most friendly and intimate character, there was necessarily a divergence of views with regard to Bulgaria—Count Kalnoky wishing to recognise Prince Ferdinand, while Prince Bismarck aimed above all things to conciliate Russia, and even suggested with this object that each of the Powers should have its own "sphere of interest" in the Balkan peninsula, Russia over Bulgaria and Austria over Servia. But such an arrangement would have been so strongly objected to in Hungary that, even if the Emperor of Austria had been inclined to accept it, its adoption was out of the question.

II. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The year in Austria-Hungary was a sad and disturbed one. The tragic death of the Crown Prince, the increasing hostility between the nationalities in the western half of the Empire, and the violence of the Opposition in Hungary, created or precipitated dangers which rendered the future of the Monarchy more uncertain than it had been for a long time past.

The death of the Crown Prince Rudolph (Jan. 30) took place under circumstances which prevented any complete account of it being given to the public, but there seems to be little doubt that he died by his own hand in consequence of a love-affair with the young Baroness Vetsera, whose dead body was found at the same time in the vicinity of the shooting-box at Meyerling, where he was staying with some guests, including Prince Philip of Coburg and Count Hoyos. The late Crown Prince was generally believed to be a Liberal, and the Clericals and the anti-Semitic party continued to show their hostility to him even after his death. But the Emperor, in thanking his people for the sympathy expressed by all classes for his loss, solemnly declared that he would adhere to the policy he had hitherto pursued, and thereby reassured those who feared that the Clericals might resume the influence which they lost on the abolition of the Concordat after the war with Prussia. The heir-apparent was now the Emperor's brother, the Archduke Karl Ludwig, but he transferred his rights to his eldest son, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand.

In February the creation of a new Czechish party, that of the "Realists," was much talked about among Austrian politicians. The other national parties of Bohemia, the "old Czechs" and the "young Czechs," claim a separate position for their country similar to that of Hungary on the basis of certain manuscripts, known as those of Koniginhof and Grüneberg, whose authenticity, however, is disputed both by German historians and by the "Realist" party among the Czechs, whose leaders are Professors

Massaryk, Kaizl, Berek, and Goll. But while repudiating what they call the "romantic politics" of the other nationalist parties, the "Realists" pursue the same object, viz. the coronation of the Emperor of Austria as King of Bohemia and the establishment in that country of a Ministry and Parliament as in Hungary. They did not, however, succeed in obtaining any seats in the election for the Bohemian Diet, which took place in July. Out of the 242 members, 71 of those elected were Germans, 54 young Czechs, 48 old Czechs, 70 landowners (all of whom belong to the Government party), and 4 bishops. The result showed a considerable increase of the young Czech party, and a corresponding diminution of the old Czech party, whose leader, Dr. Rieger, escaped defeat only by nine votes—an ominous fact for the Government, which relies chiefly for its majority in the Reichsrath on the old Czech party. The leader of the young Czechs, Dr. Gregr, is a violent opponent of the foreign policy of the Government, and in a recent speech declared that neither he nor the Bohemian people felt any sympathy for Prussia, and that they wished Austria was strong enough to break off the German alliance, which in their eyes was slavery. Perhaps it was in order to counteract the growing influence of the young Czechs that the Government appointed at the beginning of September Count Franz Thun, a known advocate of the coronation of the Emperor as King of Bohemia, to be Governor of that province. The news of the appointment naturally produced a rumour that the coronation was actually about to take place; and the Hungarian Ministers in alarm at once declared through their organ, the *Pester Lloyd*, that if the rumour proved correct the Hungarians would be entitled to cancel the compact with the other half of the Monarchy, and the union between Hungary and Cisleithania would be only a personal one, i.e. that of two independent States with a common Sovereign. That the coronation of the Emperor as King of Bohemia would be a violation of the compact with Hungary cannot be doubted, as that compact expressly states that all the provinces of Austria, including Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, which were formerly under the Bohemian crown, form one division of the Empire, and all parts of Hungary the other. The Government, however, felt that the time had arrived when some settlement of the question of nationalities in Bohemia had become imperative, and Count Taaffe, acting, it was said, under the special authority of the Emperor, accordingly proposed that the leaders of the German party in that province should meet the Czech leaders at Vienna, and negotiate with them and the Government with a view to an agreement. In October the Diet met, and the young Czechs at once proposed an address to the Crown praying for the coronation of the Emperor as King of Bohemia, and the re-establishment of an independent Government. The address was referred to a committee, who decided that the address was not a suitable one, as it touches upon

matters which fall within the province of the Legislature or of the Government, and not of the Crown, and that it should be left "to the Emperor in all confidence to select the proper moment for consummating a great work by proceeding to the coronation of himself as King of Bohemia." The decision of the committee was approved by a majority of 113 to 37 after a long and excited debate, which ended with a scandal, the young Czechs and the old Czechs nearly coming to blows. The agitation continued up to the end of the year, and the young Czechs, by making demonstrations in honour of the memory of the Protestant martyr, John Huss, increased the dissensions between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant part of the population. At length, on Dec. 18, Count Taaffe replied to an interpellation addressed to him on the Bohemian question by Herr von Plener, the German leader. "Amendments to the existing Constitution," he said, "are admissible if they are essential to the welfare of the State. The Government, however, must emphatically point out that the interests of the State demand above all, at the present moment, peaceful and progressive development, on the lines of the Constitution as it stands, and that the time is not opportune for the discussion of Constitutional questions. The Government has, therefore, no intention to advise his Majesty to sanction any changes in the Constitution, or to consent to his coronation as King of Bohemia. . . . But the Government cannot regard it as consonant with the interests of the State and with the Constitution to take up a hostile attitude towards the aspirations of any nationality—a principle which holds good also for the Germans in Bohemia."

Shortly after this statement was made, further negotiations took place for a conference between the German and Czechish deputies, and the first meeting of the conference was fixed for Jan. 4, 1890.

Some serious riots took place at Vienna in April on account of a strike of the tram-car drivers. The riots appear to have been organized by the Socialists and the anti-Semitic party; a great deal of property, chiefly belonging to Jews, was destroyed, and large bodies of troops had to be called out before the riots were suppressed. Similar strikes took place in Bohemia, and most of them resulted in the workmen's demands being granted.

In Hungary there were some alarming riots in the beginning of the year on account of the new Army Bill. By the Army Act of 1879 the peace and war establishments of the Austro-Hungarian army were fixed for ten years only, but this limitation was not introduced in the new Bill, as the Government found it inconvenient to submit the establishments for Parliamentary sanction once in ten years, especially as in Austria a majority of two-thirds is necessary, while in Hungary a simple majority of the members present is sufficient. The Hungarians, who are very sensitive on Constitutional questions, resented the omission as a violation

of their Constitutional privileges, and when the first reading of the Bill passed in the House by a majority of 267 to 141, a large crowd gathered in the streets crying "Down with Tisza," and insulting the Liberal deputies as they came out (Jan. 29). The riots lasted until Feb. 14, the Radical members meanwhile violently attacking the Ministry during the debates, and, on Feb. 16, M. Tisza, the Premier, announced that the ten years' limit would be introduced in the Bill. After a great deal more squabbling between the Radicals and the Liberals the Bill passed (April 3), but party strife had become so bitter that a reconstruction of the Cabinet could no longer be avoided. The Home Minister, Baron Orczy, was succeeded by the more energetic M. Baross, Minister of Public Works; and Professor Szilagyi (a great authority on questions of Constitutional law), Count Julius Szapary, and Dr. Weckerle were appointed Ministers of Justice, Finance, and Commerce respectively (April 7). A further change was made in June by the appointment of Count Geza Teleki as Home Minister. But the position of the Ministry was still far from solid, and another Cabinet crisis was nearly caused in October by the demand of the Hungarians that the title of the Austro-Hungarian army should be changed from "Imperial-Royal" (Kaiserlich-Königliche) to Imperial and Royal. The latter designation was introduced in 1867, when the dualist arrangement was adopted, for the Ministers and foreign representatives of the Empire, but the old title of "Imperial-Royal" was retained in the army, and there was much reluctance, especially among the higher officers of the army, to change it. The Hungarians, however, made it a Cabinet question, and as usual in such cases, the Emperor and his advisers had to yield. An order was at the same time issued, directing all Government officials in the Empire, from the Ministers downwards, to wear uniforms, except only in the Foreign Office.

Galicia was, as in previous years, the most quiet and orderly of the Austrian provinces. Much satisfaction was felt at the grant in January by the Emperor of the title of Prince to the Archbishop of Cracow, who has always been regarded by the Poles of Russia and Prussia, as well as of Austria, as the Primate of the Polish nation. In June 41 students of the Cracow University, who had gone for a holiday to Oytzoff, a picturesque village in Russian Poland, were imprisoned by the Russian police for singing Polish national songs, and after a fortnight's detention were liberated through the efforts of the Senate of the University. At the close of the year the peasants, owing to the bad harvest, suffered terribly from famine, and there were complaints of increasing poverty from nearly all the Austrian provinces, though, thanks to the ability of the Minister of Finance, M. Dunayevski, there was, for the first time in many years, no deficit, and the exchange value of the florin increased. Hungary also suffered from a bad harvest, but owing to her greater industrial activity,

she was on the whole more prosperous than the other half of the Empire. An important financial measure was the introduction on the Hungarian State Railways of a new tariff. This tariff divided Hungary into fourteen zones of 25 kilomètres each, starting from Budapest, and classed all distances beyond 350 kilomètres in the fourteenth zone. The charge for all distances travelled within each zone was the same, and the effect was to reduce most fares from 25 to 50 per cent., and some by 75 per cent. The fares for the fourteenth zone, which extended in some directions to 700 kilomètres from Budapest, were, in express trains—first-class, 9 fl. 60 kreutzers; second-class, 7 fl.; third-class, 4 fl. 80 kreutzers; in ordinary trains—first-class, 8 fl.; second-class, 5 fl. 80 kreutzers; and third-class, 4 fl. (the florin was worth about 1s. 9d.) Thus a passenger could be carried 700 kilomètres for 4 fl., or at the rate of half a kreutzer per kilomètre. This large reduction of fares instantly caused a marked rise in the number of passengers, insomuch that from August to December inclusive more passengers were carried than in the whole of the year 1888 or the year 1887. The returns were:—1887, 5,538,000 passengers; 1888, 5,381,000; 1889, 9,097,000; and of this total, 5,584,000 were booked during the last five months of the year. The number of passengers under the new system would probably have been much larger but for the badness of the harvest and the prevalence of epidemics. Be this as it may, the receipts of 1889 exceeded those of the previous twelvemonth by 904,200 fl. The receipts for 1887 were 4,216,900 fl.; 1888, 3,939,800 fl.; 1889, 4,844,000 fl. The new system did not oblige the State Railways to buy a single additional carriage or to add to their staff of servants. On the contrary, the zone tariffs enormously diminished incidental expenses, and particularly the cost of the booking-offices. Formerly 697 categories of tickets were sold at the terminus of Budapest; now there were but 92 categories, which means that six-sevenths of the labour of booking, sorting, controlling, and auditing were abolished. A single booking-clerk could do the work which formerly required two or three clerks; while in the administrative department of the railways the saving on clerks' salaries was even greater.

On the other hand, this simplification and these economies were not obtained without a sacrifice of certain things which the public considered as advantages. Return tickets, season tickets, and circular tour coupons were done away with. A passenger was no longer entitled to carry any luggage gratis, except what he could stow away in his compartment; everything consigned to the van must be paid for. Moreover, of course, the increase of passengers did not add to the comfort of travelling.

In foreign affairs the most important event was the speech addressed by the Emperor to the Austro-Hungarian delegations on June 23. "Neither our relations towards foreign Powers," he said, "nor the general direction of our foreign policy have under-

gone any change. In complete unison with our allies, my Government will strive to bring about a peaceful development of the European situation, which remains uncertain. It maintains the hope that it may be possible to preserve the blessings of peace in the future, notwithstanding the increase in the warlike forces continued to be made in all quarters, which compels us likewise not to pause in the perfection of our means of defence. The regrettable decision of King Milan to renounce the throne of Serbia has, during the minority of King Alexander, placed the supreme power in the hands of a Regency, which, in the most formal manner, has given me the assurance that it will preserve and foster the friendly relations hitherto existing between Serbia and Austria-Hungary. Animated by friendly feelings for the neighbouring Kingdom, I, on my part, entertain the same wish, and hope that the prudence and patriotism of the Servians will preserve their country from serious dangers. In Bulgaria there is order and tranquillity, and it is pleasing to witness the steady progress which that country is making, notwithstanding the difficulties of its situation."

The most significant part of this speech was the encouraging reference to Bulgaria, which was generally regarded in Europe as an answer to the Czar's statement that Montenegro was his only friend. The statement made by the Emperor about Serbia was also a valuable indication of Austrian policy, which was made more emphatic by the following words, addressed by Count Kalnoky, the Foreign Minister, to the delegation on the following day :—

"The Regents," he remarked, "have good personal reasons for being cautious and prudent, because if the changes which engross the public mind were to come about, their rule would be at an end. They have enough to do to preserve good relations with the Radical Cabinet, and are not likely to enter upon fantastic ventures, or assist towards their realisation. Serbia knows that she is not powerful enough to pursue an aggressive policy, and knows also that any attempts to become a centre of subversive agitation directed against this Monarchy would have to be opposed. The present state of excitement will not last for ever, and, as in Roumania, the love of independence will ultimately prevail—an independence which this country proclaimed as the essence of its policy towards all the Balkan States. Our Eastern policy is altogether so straightforward and disinterested, that we can hope it will be assisted by all the Powers whose intentions are equally good. We must have patience with Serbia, which has gone through a great deal in a short time. We must display the moderation of the strong, as befits a great Power, and adhere to the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of all the Balkan States. We must show them some benevolence, so long as we are not convinced of their hostile intentions. Only in the absence of any guarantees for good behaviour must we guard and

protect our interests at any cost. I really cannot see how Serbia can enter upon the foolhardy policy attributed to her, and I still hope that the Regency and the Government will keep within bounds, and enable us to maintain friendly and neighbourly relations with them. We have full confidence," he added, "in our Allies. Our relations with Germany are so cordial and, during the ten years of their existence in their present form, have been so strengthened, that they are beyond question. I need, therefore, say no more about them. In a short time an opportunity will occur, at the meeting of the two Sovereigns, to confirm this union of friendship. Our relations with Italy are of exactly the same kind as the alliance with Germany. Between ourselves and Italy there are not the historic connections that exist between us and Germany. Old differences have not yet been quite forgotten by the people of both countries, and are wantonly fostered and kept alive by the Party hostile to our union; but I am convinced that this agitation will cease to have any influence in time, and I am also satisfied that we have in Italy as firm an Ally in every respect as she has in us."

As regards Bulgaria, Count Kalnoky, in reply to a question from the Hungarian delegate, Dr. Falk, repeated what he had said two years before—that he considered Prince Ferdinand was legally elected as far as the Bulgarians were concerned, and that Austria was prepared to recognize him, but that the third Article of the Berlin Treaty required his recognition by the Porte and all the Powers. Count Kalnoky added that it was doubtful whether the revival of the question of the Prince's recognition would be to the interest of the Bulgarians. Austria would not raise any obstacles, but a one-sided recognition could not be of any advantage, and general recognition would no doubt take place ultimately if the process of consolidation continued.

The visit of the Emperor of Austria to Berlin in August contributed to strengthen the alliance between the two Empires. There was a sham fight at Spandau, and a banquet in the Castle, at which the Emperors exchanged the assurance that their armies should fight side by side. At the end of October Count Kalnoky paid a visit to Prince Bismarck at Friedrichsruhe with the object, it was said, of laying the foundation of closer commercial relations between the two Empires. As nearly all the existing commercial treaties between the various European States will expire in the year 1892, the question of any new arrangements it might be desirable to make after that period was the subject of much discussion both in Germany and in Austria, and one of the most favourite projects in this connection was that Austria, Germany, and Italy should form a Customs' Union among themselves. On Nov. 14 the German Emperor visited the Emperor Francis Joseph at Innsbruck, and the meeting of the two Sovereigns was again most cordial. The influence exercised by Germany over Austria at these reciprocal visits of their sovereigns and statesmen was

.

undoubtedly in the direction of peace; and that some gentle pressure in this sense was necessary was shown by the warlike tone adopted by the Opposition in the Hungarian Parliament, and even by semi-official organs of the Hungarian Press.

CHAPTER III.

EASTERN EUROPE.

I. RUSSIA.

THE history of Russia during the year has been chiefly marked by the usual Nihilistic conspiracies at home and a foreign policy which kept the other European nations in constant alarm. The finances of the country, however, have, under the skilful direction of the Finance Minister, M. Vischnegradzky, been maintained in the satisfactory position to which they had attained in the previous year. The budget, published on January 12, showed a surplus of 4,500,000 roubles, the "ordinary" expenditure being estimated at 856,800,000 roubles against 861,300,000 as ordinary receipts; but "extraordinary" expenditure, as in former Russian budgets, was estimated for which exactly balanced the two sides of the account. In March a further step was taken towards the conversion of the Russian State Debt. A new loan, to the nominal amount of 175,000,000 gold roubles, was concluded with a syndicate of Berlin, Paris, and St. Petersburg bankers for the conversion of the Five per Cent. Consolidated Russian Railway Bonds of 1870 to 1884.

The explosion on March 28 of a bomb at Zurich, which killed one of the Russian students that were making experiments with it, produced great consternation at St. Petersburg, where it was believed that the bombs were intended to be used at Berlin during the Czar's visit there. Numerous arrests were made at St. Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, Kharkoff, and Kieff, and the traces were discovered of a conspiracy to assassinate the Emperor, Count Tolstoi, and a number of State dignitaries and officials. Other conspiracies were discovered later, and towards the end of the year came the report of a Nihilistic outbreak at Yakoutsk in Siberia. Much valuable information on the subject was given to the Russian police by a former Nihilist leader named Tichomiroff, who had taken an active part in the assassination of Alexander II., and had since lived abroad. Having published a pamphlet in Paris on Nihilism, in which he showed an inclination to abandon his former colleagues and become reconciled with the Government, the Russian police entered into relations with him, and the Czar permitted him to return to Russia, where he established himself at Odessa.

The scheme of administrative reform proposed by the Minister

of the Interior, Count Tolstoi, could not be completely carried out, owing to the Count's death in August; but he was succeeded by Senator Durnovo, who had always been a strong advocate of the late Minister's policy, and shortly after one of the chief features of the scheme, a law for the reorganisation of the provincial administration dealing with the affairs of the peasants, was promulgated and set in operation.

Further steps in the policy of Russification were this year taken in Lithuania and the Baltic provinces. On February 13 the Governor of Lithuania revived Mouravieff's order of 1864, punishing the use of the Polish language in public places with a fine of twenty-five roubles. An attempt was at the same time made to prevent Polish from being spoken in shops: the shopkeeper was to be fined for the first offence, and his shop was to be closed for the second. Such measures, however, have been common in Poland during the last twenty-five years, though it has hitherto been found impracticable to carry them out. But the Baltic provinces have, since their annexation to Russia in the eighteenth century, had the free use of their language, which is German among the educated classes and Lettish among the peasants. In July, however, a decree was issued ordering the German schools to use Russian as the language of instruction, and in December the employment of the Russian language was made obligatory in all administrative and judicial documents, and the German judges were superseded by Russian ones, who, being imported from distant parts of the empire, were entirely ignorant of the laws and customs of the Baltic provinces. The result was a helpless confusion, which almost paralysed trade, and caused incessant difficulties in the most ordinary concerns of daily life.

Towards the end of the year a terrible story of slaughter of Siberian prisoners arrived in Europe. At Yakutsk, in Eastern Siberia, some thirty exiles under administrative order—that is to say, who had not been condemned by any law court or tribunal—were to proceed to some more distant stations. The temporary Governor Ostashine had issued new rules, which, if carried out, would, for a journey through the Polar wastes of Siberia, have resulted in the death of a great many of the travellers. A joint petition was therefore drawn up by all the exiles, requesting the restoration of the old *régime*. The exiles were told not to present themselves in a body at the Government offices, but to wait for the reply in a private house. Here, however, a subordinate officer of police came and ordered them to go in a body to the Government-house. The exiles hesitated in the face of these contradictory orders, and the police and soldiers, suddenly losing patience, attacked and fired upon them. The soldiers were rendered all the more brutal by the fact that some of the exiles had pistols and made some slight show of defence. One policeman was killed, according to his own dying statement, accidentally by the soldiers, and the Governor Ostashine (who

came up during the disturbance) and an officer were wounded. Of the exiles six were killed outright, including one young woman, Mdle. Gourevitch, and nine wounded, Mdle. Zorastroff being among the latter.

Under the pretext that the drawing up of thirty petitions against an official decree constituted an act of insurrection, a court-martial was held. All the exiles were condemned to long terms of penal servitude, and three were sentenced to death. They were subsequently hanged. One among them, named Bernstein, who had been struck by four bullets, had to be carried under the gallows in his bed. When the rope had been put round his neck the bed was removed and he was left hanging. It was at first believed that the Emperor would punish the officials who were responsible for this atrocious deed, but instead of this they were promoted for their "zeal and energy," and the impunity thus secured for abuses of power by the officials seems to have led to another horrible incident, which occurred in November in the Kara mines. Among the prisoners was a lady of education and refinement, Madame Nadejda Sihida, who had been condemned to penal servitude because some copies of the Russian revolutionary organ, *Narodnaya Volia*, had been found in her house. One of her companions having been insulted by the director of the prison, Madame Sihida slapped his face, upon which he ordered her to be stripped and flogged. The unfortunate woman died in two days from the effects of the 100 blows she received, and three of her friends and fellow-prisoners then poisoned themselves.

An Imperial decree, dated January 12, ordered an important reorganisation to be effected in the Russian army. The regular army destined to take the field had hitherto comprised one hundred and ninety-two infantry regiments and fifty-six rifle battalions, four of which formed a rifle brigade with a separate organisation outside the division unit. Thirty-two of these rifle battalions were recruited in Europe, the rest in Asia. They consisted of four rifle guards battalions and eight Finnish and twenty ordinary army rifle battalions, each with a peace establishment of seventeen officers and four hundred and forty-seven combatants, and a war establishment of twenty-one officers and nine hundred and sixty combatants.

These twenty rifle battalions were now to be subdivided into forty new ones, which meant an addition of about twenty thousand combatants to the war establishment. By the decree it was ordered that three reserve infantry cadre battalions should also be similarly subdivided, and henceforward form regiments with two battalions each. The above measure, if generally applied, would involve an addition of not less than one hundred and nine battalions, each with a war establishment of sixteen officers and nine hundred and fifty-eight combatants, or an increase of the war strength by between eighty and a hundred thousand men.

This, however, was only the first step in a scheme of thorough reorganisation, more logical and more effective, and more in accordance with the present state of military science, than any reform that had been attempted in Russia previously.

The principal feature of the new Russian Army Reform was the augmentation of the units, which there is superabundant material to fill. The number of army corps was increased, the number of rifle battalions was doubled, and the strength of the reserve infantry cadres, equivalent to the first or effective portion of the Austrian Landsturm, was also to be doubled. The Russian army, in all its branches, was, in fact, subjected to a thorough reorganisation, more logical and more effective, and more in accordance with the present state of military science, than any reform hitherto attempted.

At the same time intelligence was received of large reinforcements having been sent by the Central Asiatic Railway to Turkestan, possibly with a view to action against Persia, or at least to military pressure on the Shah. This would, however, hardly impede the great reform in Europe, which, while making Russia for a year or two less ready for action—a circumstance that accounts for the unusually peaceful attitude she maintained during the year—opened up the prospect of Russia being hereafter a more formidable Power than ever, provided the reorganisation were allowed time to be accomplished.

On the plea of an increase of smuggling, a considerable augmentation was also made of the corps called "The Frontier Guard." This corps, though under the orders of the Minister of Finance, is organised and equipped just like the army, and is under the command of officers of the regular troops detached for the purpose. The men of the "Frontier Guard," divided into brigades like an army corps, are posted along the whole of the Russian sea and land frontiers, from the White Sea to the Black Sea, the strength of each brigade being from 1,500 to 2,000 men; it was now doubled, making about 30,000 men in all. As these troops are constantly on active service in pursuit of smugglers, they have to be perfectly acquainted with every road and path in the district where they are posted, and would therefore be invaluable in time of war. They would, in fact, be the vanguard of an advancing Russian army, and their officers are accordingly selected from among the best men of the regular regiments. On the Prussian frontier alone there are five brigades of them, making about 10,000 men; there are about 5,000 men on the Austrian frontier, and 3,000 on the Roumanian frontier. On the German and Austrian frontiers these guards were at the close of the year strengthened by six regiments of cavalry and four of infantry from the Caucasus. A number of observation towers were erected close to the borders of Galicia, and barracks were built for the additional troops as if they were permanently to be stationed there. Three more iron-

clads, each of about 11,000 tons burden, with engines of 12,000 horse-power, and carrying six heavy guns, were also ordered for the Black Sea fleet; and six torpedo boats, worked with petroleum instead of coal, were under construction, four for the Baltic, and two for the Black Sea. Finally, extensive orders were given for new guns and strategical railways, and it was estimated that by 1892 Russia would have a powerful fleet in the Black Sea, double lines of railway to her Western frontier, 3,000,000 magazine rifles, and 150,000,000 rounds of ammunition.

Under these circumstances Russia abstained from a war-like policy, though her diplomacy was very active. The extraordinary expedition in January of the "Free Cossack," Captain Atchinoff, with 150 followers, to the coast of Abyssinia, was in no way countenanced by the Russian Government, and nothing more was heard of it after the French Admiral had captured the members of the expedition and carried them off to Obock. But in Persia the rivalry between England and Russia again became very keen, and the latter power strove hard to counteract the advantage obtained by the former in the opening of the Karun river. Thanks to the efforts of the Russian envoy, Prince Dolgorouki, a Russian consul was installed at Meshed, and Persia renewed her promise to make a good road from that town to join the Russian road from Askabad. Among other demands stated to have been made by Prince Dolgorouki to the Persian Government are the following:—1. That all contracts made with foreigners for the construction of railways in Persia during the next five years shall be communicated to the Russian Government before they are concluded, and that if any Russian contractors should be disposed to contract on favourable terms they should be given the priority. 2. That Persia shall make a high road from Askabad to Erdebib. 3. That Persia shall open the lagoon of Murdab to Russian ships. 4. That Persia shall make its portion of the high road from Khorassan to Askabad. 5. That Persia shall make a high road from Resht to Teheran. It was reported that the Shah's visit to St. Petersburg was the consequence of his having agreed to these demands. Russia did not succeed, however, in obtaining the key of Persia, the Fort of Kelat-i-Nadir, which is alleged to have been the chief object of the Russian negotiations. The Shah had a splendid reception at all the places where he stopped on Russian soil, and on his arrival at St. Petersburg (May 21) the Czar entered his carriage and exchanged cordial greetings with him. On the Shah's departure, however, it is alleged that the Czar plainly told him that, if he allowed himself to be persuaded by England to make her concessions unfavourable to Russia, there were 100,000 Russian bayonets on his frontier which a single telegram would put in motion.

Great commotion was caused in European courts by a speech made by the Czar on May 30, in drinking the health of the Prince

of Montenegro on the occasion of the betrothal of the Prince's daughter to the Grand Duke Peter, second son of the Grand Duke Nicholas, the Czar's uncle. In this speech Alexander III. described the Prince of Montenegro as his "only sincere and faithful friend"—a reproach addressed not only to Bulgaria, Greece, Servia, and Roumania, but to Germany and the other great European Powers. It produced some uneasiness at Berlin and Vienna, and great exultation among the Montenegrins, who already looked forward to the restoration under the sceptre of the Prince of Montenegro of the ancient Servian Empire of Douchan, which consisted of Servia, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Southern Bosnia, Macedonia, Albania, and Bulgaria. Both the hopes and the fears, however, that were thus caused were dissipated by the Czar's visit to Berlin on October 11. This was, no doubt, primarily an act of courtesy, but the Czar's interviews with Prince Bismarck also gave it a political significance, and it has since transpired that the Czar took the opportunity of assuring himself that Germany would support his refusal to recognise Prince Ferdinand as the ruler of Bulgaria. It was now the turn of the diplomatists to rejoice, and of the political agitators to be depressed. But though the heads of the European Governments were evidently desirous of peace, at all events for the present, the old hostile currents in their respective countries flowed as strongly as ever. The national antagonism between Russians and Germans constantly found vent in bitter newspaper articles which even the censorship did not venture to suppress, and the quotation of the Bulgarian loan on the Vienna Stock Exchange produced such anger at St. Petersburg that the Russian Ambassador at the Hofburg had to address a remonstrance to the Austrian Government on the subject.

II. TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE.

The East of Europe was throughout the year in a very disturbed condition, but the determination of the Great Powers to avoid war prevented the many complications which arose from attaining any serious development. The German Emperor's visit to the Sultan in October produced a report that attempts were being made to induce Turkey to enter into the Triple Alliance. To those, however, who appreciated the peculiar position of Turkey among the European States it was evident that such a step on the part of the Sultan would have been in the highest degree impolitic. Turkey was still fettered by her financial obligations towards Russia in connection with the war indemnity, and her internal condition and the dangers to which she was exposed from the small States on her frontiers rendered it a matter of vital importance to her not to take a course which would infallibly be regarded as an act of hostility towards Russia.

Even the German Emperor's visit—which appears to have been prompted mainly by his passion for travelling—gave some offence at St. Petersburg, and the cautious Ministers of the Ottoman Empire were careful to deprive the visit as much as possible of any political significance. At the same time they showed a strong desire to be on good terms with England. They supported the proposed conversion of the Egyptian debt, which broke down through the opposition of France and Russia, and seemed willing even to agree to a permanent occupation of Egypt by England, provided that the Sultan's sovereignty were recognised by the admission of Turkish garrisons in some of the Egyptian towns.

In August, owing to the strong representations made by Lord Salisbury as to the abuses of the civil and military administration in Armenia, a Commission of Inquiry was sent into the province, and a number of men and women who had suffered indignities at the hands of the notorious Kurdish chief, Moussa Bey, proceeded to Constantinople at the invitation of the Government to bring their charges against him in person. The trial took place in November, and after several sittings, in the course of which the Public Prosecutor browbeat the witnesses and acted generally rather as the counsel for the accused than for the prosecution, Moussa Bey was acquitted. A new trial, however, was ordered, which had not been concluded at the end of the year.

The smouldering discontent which had for some time existed in Crète become so threatening at the beginning of June that several battalions of troops were sent to the island, and Mahmoud Pasha, the ex-Finance Minister, proceeded thither, as Envoy Extraordinary. The members of the Opposition in the Cretan Assembly took the opportunity of presenting the Turkish commissioner with a memorial setting forth their demands. These included the recall of the Governor, Sartinski Pasha, fresh elections, the application of the customs' revenue to local purposes, and other reforms connected with the finances of the island and the judicial and administrative departments. There was also an agitation, said to have been promoted by the State councillor Niaga, for the annexation of the island to Greece; but this project was in no way countenanced by the Greek Government. On July 12 Mahmoud Pasha was suddenly recalled to Constantinople; an insurrection broke out in the interior, and the authorities of two Cretan villages, Vamos and Cidonia, were expelled by the insurgents, who had several sanguinary encounters with the Turkish troops. On July 28 another Commission was despatched from Constantinople with more troops. The governor was recalled, and Riza Pasha, the head of the Commission, was provisionally appointed to succeed him. At the same time six Cretan delegates, two of whom were Mussulmans and the rest Christians, proceeded at the invitation of the Porte to Constantinople. Meanwhile fighting still went on in various parts of the island, and a Christian village, inhabited by about 150 families

was burnt to the ground. Terrible acts of vengeance, accompanied by great material losses and suffering, were reported from all quarters. In order to prevent further bloodshed between the Mussulmans and Christians, Riza Pasha ordered the Turkish troops to withdraw into the forts; but the peasants of the two religions continued to fight with each other, and many Christian families escaped to Greece in order to save their lives and properties. On Aug. 5 the Greek Government, alarmed at this immigration and the strong feeling produced among the Greek people by the conduct of the Porte, sent a telegraphic Circular to its agents abroad, complaining of the partial manner in which the Turkish authorities were dealing with the troubles, and declaring that it was impossible for Greece to look with complacency upon the prospect of having to feed and lodge perhaps fifty or sixty thousand destitute Cretan refugees. An urgent appeal was therefore made to the Great Powers to send at once sufficient ships and forces to Crete to restore order and ensure the safety of lives and property. The Circular added that, failing such action, it would be impossible for the Greek Government to forego taking energetic measures themselves, and that the entire Greek fleet was being put in readiness to proceed to Crete with sufficient troops on board to be landed for the above-mentioned purposes.

Count Kalnoky, the Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, on receiving the Circular, expressed the opinion that the Greek proposal was an impracticable one, but stated that he was ready to adopt any course which the Powers most directly interested might desire. He was somewhat uneasy at the tone of M. Tricoupis' communication, and feared that any untoward event in Crete might provoke a war which it was the general interest of Europe to prevent. Austria-Hungary, however, the Count remarked, was only interested in Crete in a secondary degree.

Lord Salisbury stated that her Majesty's Government would, in conjunction with their allies, give the Greek Circular their careful consideration; that they were fully sensible of the serious character of the events that were taking place in Crete, but that he felt bound to warn Greece that her Majesty's Government were unable to admit that these events furnished any valid ground for material intervention on the part of Greece.

Signor Crispi, the Italian Premier, on hearing of the Greek Circular, telegraphed to Berlin, Vienna, and London, in order that entire harmony might exist in any action to be taken by the European Powers in Eastern affairs. He could not for his own part see any reason for warlike preparations on the part of Greece, and he considered her attitude very injudicious.

The German Government counselled the Porte, through the Turkish Ambassador at Berlin, to restore order immediately by means of Turkish forces alone, and said they could give no countenance to the pretensions of Greece.

M. de Giers, the Foreign Minister of Russia, strongly remon-

strated with the Greek Government, and urged that the action they threatened to take could not be accepted by any of the Powers. He also telegraphed to the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople that, while fully recognising the rights of Turkey, Russia insisted upon her fulfilling the duties corresponding to those rights by at once restoring order with due regard to humanity and with equal justice to all inhabitants alike.

The French Foreign Minister, M. Spuller, informed the Greek Minister in Paris that he was greatly surprised at receiving the Circular, as it was not consistent with M. Tricoupis' previous language, and not justified by the fiscal causes of the Cretan insurrection, which had no national character.

On Aug. 12 Lord Salisbury expressed to the Turkish Ambassador his hope that the Porte would lose no time in redressing any genuine grievance of which the Cretans might have a right to complain, and that any necessary measures might be taken with promptitude. His lordship was pressed by the Ambassador to say whether her Majesty's Government would forcibly prevent any intervention by Greece, but the Premier declined to give any such pledge. During a conversation with Sir R. Morier, M. de Giers informally suggested that the consular body in Crete should act together; but the British Consul in Crete, M. Billiotti, telegraphed to Lord Salisbury deprecating such action, and stating that the sufferings and wants of the Mussulmans were no less great than those of the Christians.

Meanwhile the Porte, in a Circular dated Aug. 11, attributed the Cretan disturbances to the antagonism between the minority and the majority in the Cretan Assembly, and at the same time announced that Shakir Pasha had been directed to proceed to the island to establish a state of siege, to institute courts-martial for the trial of all offenders against the law, and to publish a proclamation inviting the rebels to return to the path of duty. In conclusion the Porte appealed to the principle of international law which recognises in each independent State the right of dealing with its own internal affairs, and precludes all foreign intervention or interference of any kind whatever. Shakir Pasha, the new governor *ad interim*, had been ambassador at St. Petersburg since 1878; he was educated in the French military school of St. Cyr, and had the reputation of being a diplomatist of genial manners and conciliatory disposition. On his arrival he issued a proclamation establishing martial law, and entered into negotiations with the chief native leaders, but with little success. The sacking and burning of villages and sanguinary conflicts between Christians and Mussulmans went on as before, and the Turkish troops seemed utterly incapable of restoring order. On Aug. 20 more reinforcements were sent to the island, and the insurgents began to withdraw into the mountains in the interior. Peace was thus gradually restored, but the Government considered

it necessary to increase the force in the island to 40,000 men. A great number of arrests were made, and many persons who were compromised in the insurrection escaped to Athens, where they excited public opinion against the Turks, thereby causing great difficulties to the Greek Government, as it met with no support from the other Powers in its attempts to produce a European intervention in favour of the Cretans. Meanwhile order was gradually restored, and at the beginning of December a firman was issued granting the Cretans an amnesty and making various changes in the administration. This was a very elaborate document, containing eleven paragraphs, of which the following is the substance:—The term of office of the Governors-General was no longer to be limited. The number of deputies in the Assembly was reduced to fifty-seven—namely, thirty-five Christians and twenty-two Mussulmans. They were to be chosen by electors, of whom each commune would depute five, and who would assemble in the chief town of the canton.

The gendarmerie, hitherto composed of natives, were in the future to be recruited from among the inhabitants of other provinces of the Ottoman Empire, natives, however, not being excluded. The revenues derived from tithes were to be distributed among the inhabitants of the villages on the average of the tithe receipts for six years, three productive and three unproductive. The amnesty was not to apply to Cretans who had been condemned as the leaders of the late movement, or to persons accused of crimes against the Commission law.

This Firman, however, was not regarded by the Powers as satisfactory, and (Dec. 15) the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs addressed a circular note to the representatives of Greece abroad on the subject. The Firman was, he said, a violation of the rights of the Cretans, which have, for the past twenty years, been recognised by the Porte and confirmed by the Treaty of Berlin, whose signatories undertook to make that instrument respected. He added that the alleged pacification of Crete was questionable, inasmuch as every condition of an endurable régime had been suppressed by the Porte. The unjust conduct of Turkey towards the Cretans, who had been deprived of their rights, imposed obligations and duties which no Hellenic Government could neglect at the opportune moment.

The firm language of the Minister in this despatch produced a strong impression among the Representatives of the Powers. The Ambassadors at Constantinople, as well as the various Consuls of the Powers in Crete, condemned the action of the Porte, and represented the situation as full of danger. Finally, the Cretan leaders stated that their compatriots would never obey the Firman, and would rather plunge the island again into anarchy than submit to such humiliations after all their struggles and sacrifices.

While Greece was thus taking up the cause of the Cretans,

strated with the Greek Government, and urged that the ~~ant~~ they threatened to take could not be accepted by any ~~ofes.~~ Powers. He also telegraphed to the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople that, while fully recognising the rights ~~or~~ Turkey, Russia insisted upon her fulfilling the duties ~~corst~~ sponding to those rights by at once restoring order with ~~is~~ regard to humanity and with equal justice to all inhabitants ~~is,~~ alike.

The French Foreign Minister, M. Spuller, informed the ~~Sion~~ Minister in Paris that he was greatly surprised at reception in Circular, as it was not consistent with M. Tricoupis' ~~n~~ Crete language, and not justified by the fiscal ~~causes~~ ~~ca.~~ He still insurrection, which had no national chara ~~was~~ fast diminishing,

On Aug. 12 Lord Salisbury ~~expy~~ circulated newspaper in ~~bassador~~ his hope that the ~~Porte~~ ~~sation.~~

any genuine grievance of ~~v-1~~ Ferdinand of Bulgaria at the to complain, and that ~~r~~ was somewhat critical, and it was with promptitude. ~~ies~~ that he would soon have to abdicate. to say whether ~~h-1~~ the Conservative Ministers Stoiloff and any intervention the Cabinet had made M. Stambouloff the ~~de~~ such pledge Bulgaria, and the Prince, by hoisting a new flag of Giers in ~~nd~~ shutting himself up in his palace during the Bul- should religious festivals, had produced much discontent among ~~teleg~~jects. This ill-feeling was still further increased by his unceremonious treatment of the Bishops who were members of the Holy Synod. This body assembled at Sofia (Jan. 8), and shortly after the Bishops were ordered by Dr. Stransky, the Minister of Public Worship, to attend at the palace. This command the President of the Synod, Monsignore Simeon, Bishop of Shumla, declined to obey, giving, as his reason, that Prince Ferdinand, since his arrival in the country, had not only evinced no respect for the Orthodox Clergy, but had, on the contrary, fostered the Catholic propaganda, and favoured the Greek to the detriment of the Bulgarian Clergy. Thus he had practically done everything in his power to create ecclesiastical anarchy. "Our refusal," the Bishop concluded, "is meant as a protest against the Independent Bulgarian Church."

The refusal and its grounds were recorded in the minutes of the Synod, whereupon Monsignore Simeon was summoned to the Prime Minister and Minister of Public Worship, to give an explanation of his conduct. But this summons had no better success than the original command. The Government accordingly issued an order to the Synod to dissolve, and commanded the Bishops to leave Sofia for their dioceses within three days. This order was also disregarded; and the Bishops of Tirnova, Varna, and Vratza were then seized in their residences by gendarmes, who escorted them to the outside of the city, and accompanied them to their respective dioceses. The conduct of

the Bishops in this matter was doubtless inspired by the Bulgarian Exarch at Constantinople, who is a known Russophile; the lower clergy, however, are patriotic Bulgarians, and the incident had no further consequences, especially as it soon after transpired that the real object of the convocation of the Synod was to dismiss the anti-Russian Metropolitan of Sofia.

In October considerable sensation was produced by an article in the semi-official *Fremdenblatt* of Vienna suggesting that the time had arrived for a European recognition of Prince Ferdinand as ruler of Bulgaria. The writer, who began by expressing disappointment at the Porte abandoning the intention attributed to it of taking steps to bring about the recognition of the Bulgarian Prince, urged that to pave the way to a disentanglement of the Bulgarian difficulty was really in the interest of Turkey as well as of Europe at large, and added that the initiative to such a step could be taken only by Turkey herself. Taking this initiative, he said, would demonstrate the reality of the power of the Suzerain. He added that Bulgaria has, moreover, already given sufficient proofs of its sense of order and of its capacity for self-government; that the recognition of Prince Ferdinand by the Porte would be followed by other Powers—Austria, for instance; that the solution of such an intricate question as that of Bulgaria cannot succeed except by degrees, and must have a commencement somewhere; and, finally, that if the Porte took the initiative demanded of her, it was to be expected that no Cabinet would be able to find sufficient reasons for declining its co-operation, or excluding itself from taking action in the same direction.

The Porte, however, showed no disposition to move in the matter, in view of the strong opposition of Russia; and the idea of a European recognition, which had evidently been started by Count Kalnoky, was then dropped. On Oct. 9 Prince Ferdinand left Sofia on a visit to Vienna and Paris with the object, it was said, of personally conferring with some European statesmen on the question of his recognition, though it seems more probable that his journey was connected with projects of a matrimonial alliance with a Bourbon princess and also with negotiations which had been in progress for a Bulgarian loan. In the latter respect he was successful; he obtained a loan of 1,200,000*l.*, the Austro-Hungarian Government having allowed it to be quoted on the exchanges of Vienna and Buda-Pesth. The Prince returned to Sofia on Nov. 3, and a few hours after his arrival he opened the *Sobranje* with a speech in which he dwelt on the progress of the country, and observed that "the Bulgarian people have not only acquired the sympathy of the civilised world, but have also deserved the eulogy of one of the most valiant and wise monarchs, as well as of the most celebrated statesmen of Europe." There was no doubt ample ground for the Prince's congratulations on the progress of the country, but the statistical returns published

by the Government showed that as regards education the Bulgarian people were still very backward. In a population of 3,154,885, nearly 2,000,000 of whom were above the age of 15, only 387,773 persons could read or write or do both; the rest were totally illiterate. The population was rapidly increasing, although the Mahommedans were emigrating in considerable numbers, especially from the western districts.

In Serbia the year was full of anxieties and political crises. The new Constitution (*see* ANNUAL REGISTER, 1888, p. 308) was accepted on Jan. 2 in the Skouptchina by the decisive majority of 494 to 73. This result was by no means a foregone conclusion, as it was known that thousands of roubles had been distributed by the Russian Consul among the deputies to induce them to vote against the Government; and the fact was boldly referred to in the following speech of M. Tachanovitch, President of the Skouptchina:—

“The country which fosters agitation against our King and the new Constitution is no friend of Servia. I know some of you have been ignorant and weak enough to accept money from the enemy of the Fatherland. We do not blame, we only pity, those poor creatures. I, the conspirator of Zaitschar, who have sat in chains for the liberties of our country—I tell you, as my deepest conviction, that Servia may be proud and may feel happy to see Milan Obrenovitch on the throne. I, the conspirator of Zaitschar, tell you that King Milan gives us in this Constitution all it is in his power to give. It is he who is making enormous sacrifices, not we, who are risking nothing and profiting by everything. This is why I recommend you to accept the Constitution without amendment. Brethren! return the bribes, and vote for the Constitution.”

The effect of this short exhortation was remarkable. It told on the naïve consciences of the hearers, and those who had just before been boasting of their Russian gold suddenly grew silent before the contemptuous glances of their neighbours.

On the following day a special sitting of the Skouptchina took place for the signing of the Constitution. The President opened the proceedings by reading a Royal decree giving a free pardon to all political offenders without exception, after which the King, accompanied by the young Crown Prince Alexander, delivered an address in which he pointed out that the first ten years of his reign had been devoted to assuring the independence of the country and to converting “the former patriarchal Servia into a modern civilised State.” This speech was received with tremendous enthusiasm, the deputies all standing, and the King then took a pen and wrote his signature to the new Constitution. The event was made the subject of much popular rejoicing, both in the provinces and the capital. The streets of Belgrade were decorated with flags and illuminated in the evening, and a torchlight procession marched to the King’s

palace. Thus the King, after steering with consummate skill through the endless difficulties that surrounded him, seemed at last to have arrived at the long-desired haven; yet two months only after the Constitution for which he had struggled so much was issued, he announced his intention to abdicate. On March 7 he signed a Manifesto to the Servian people declaring that his abdication was the outcome of a resolution taken long ago. After explaining the principles which guided him in his internal and foreign policy, namely, to constitute Servia as a modern State, and an element of order and tranquillity in the Balkan Peninsula, the Manifesto proceeded as follows:—

“A State founded in the nineteenth century must strive for progress, culture, and civilisation, no matter at what cost. This your King, on the eve of his retirement, again brings to your notice. The external affairs of Servia are now so ordered that I am convinced that the country will derive benefit from my labours. Above all, my endeavours were directed towards winning the friendship and support of those Powers who were interested in the maintenance of the Berlin Treaty and of European peace.”

The Manifesto next appealed to the Servian Parties to assist in carrying out the new Constitution. It recommended King Alexander to the love of the Servian people, pointing out that the Regency had been placed in the hands of tried patriots and wise statesmen, and expressed the conviction that the Regency would continue to lead the country along the path of progress, and so conduct Servia's foreign policy that internal peace and order should be preserved to the Balkan Peninsula, as well as all the other advantages which King Milan had attained for it with the help and goodwill of Europe.

The King at the same time addressed a letter to M. Ristitch, appointing him and Generals Protitch and Belmarkovitch Regents during the minority of the Crown Prince, who was only in his thirteenth year. What was the real reason of his abdication (which the German and Austrian Governments did their utmost to prevent) is not known, but the following extract from a letter addressed by the King to a Hungarian friend probably gives the true explanation of it:—“I suffer dreadfully. Nobody can conceive what I have passed through. I have turned grey, and my hair has thinned, owing, say the doctors, to nervous debility. For weeks I have slept for only two or three hours every night, and have risen unrefreshed. The other day I received a delegation from the Jewish community, and, while addressing them, turned giddy and trembled so violently that they said afterwards that the King was tipsy. If they only knew how hard I have worked of late! The Constitution is entirely my own doing, and the worry and labour have worn me out. I long for freedom as a schoolboy yearns for his holidays.”

The leading spirit of the Regency was M. Ristitch, who had already been four times Premier, and was one of the Regents during the minority of King Milan. Some have called him "the Cavour of Serbia"; but though he would doubtless gladly take any opportunity of enlarging his country, he has always pursued a very cautious policy, leaning sometimes on Russia, at other times on Austria, according to the circumstances of the moment. The appointment of the Regents was followed by that of a Radical and Russophile Cabinet, with General Sava Gruitch at its head. Under a convention entered into between the ex-King and the Regents, the latter were bound not to permit Queen Natalie to reside permanently in Serbia, but any meetings between her and her son abroad might be permitted by the Regents. They were further pledged loyally to carry out the provisions of the Constitution in the sense in which they were intended by the ex-King, and not to alter the foreign policy of the country. The ex-King left Belgrade on March 19, and the Regents, with the new king, Alexander, carried on the Government on the old lines. Some riots took place at Belgrade at the end of May in which a student and a gendarme were killed, and a number of persons were seriously wounded; but these disturbances were chiefly caused by personal enmity towards M. Garaschanin, the ex-Premier and leader of the Progressist Party. A more serious matter was the decree issued by the Regents on June 5 forcibly terminating the convention with the French company which had previously worked the Servian State railways, and authorising the Servian Government to take over all the lines, plant, and other property of the company. The French Foreign Minister, M. Spuller, at once protested against this proceeding, which the Servian Government defended by alleging that the company had utterly disregarded the interests of the travelling public and had devoted itself exclusively to the task of procuring for its shareholders the largest possible dividend. Ultimately, after much negotiation, a compromise was arrived at under which the company was allowed to resume the working of the line on its giving guarantees for securing the comfort of passengers and the regularity of the traffic.

A great sensation was produced by the return to Belgrade of the ex-Metropolitan Michael, who had been banished by King Milan, and by his re-appointment in the place of the Metropolitan Theodosius, who was a friend of the late King. The new Metropolitan had during his exile resided in Russia, and it was alleged that he brought from the Russian Government a proposal that Prince Nicholas of Montenegro should be named King of a new Servian kingdom to comprise Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, and the Herzegovina. However this may be, the new Metropolitan was loud in his professions of loyalty to the young King, whom he anointed on July 2 in the Monastery of Zitcha, M. Persiani, the Russian Minister, being the only foreign

representative who was present at the ceremony. M. Ristitch, who was absent through indisposition, sent a congratulatory telegram to the King, in which he stated that the chief points of his policy were the maintenance of the Obrenovitch dynasty, the consolidation of the internal affairs of Servia, the ordering of her finances, and the observance of economy in all branches of the administration. "Peace," he added, "must be restored both in our domestic and our foreign affairs." The ceremony of anointment was followed (June 27) by religious ceremonies celebrating the quinqucentenary of the Battle of Kossovo, at which the Servian Empire was destroyed by the Turks. At the requiem mass performed by the Metropolitan Michael in the Cathedral of Krushevatz on this occasion the King, the Regents, and all the Ministers were present, and the Metropolitan made a stirring speech on "the Servian heroes of Kossovo."

The uneasiness which was felt in Europe at the new turn of events in Servia was a good deal increased by the decision of the Servian Government to equip the third levy of recruits. Under the reorganisation scheme of March 1888 the Servian army consisted of the regular forces and the militia, the latter of which, like the Landwehr in Austria, was made up of the first and second levies. No mention was made of a third levy, which would correspond to the Austrian Landsturm; and the fact that this third levy was constituted so soon after King Milan's abdication naturally led to the inference that the new Government intended to pursue a warlike policy. The reason alleged by the Government was the suppression of brigandage; but the creation of a Landsturm would certainly have been a singular expedient for such a purpose, and the measure was probably rather connected with internal party disputes, the arming of the peasants having for some time been a favourite scheme of the Radical leaders. The Servian armaments caused some alarm in Bulgaria, especially as violent attacks upon that country were at the same time being made by the Radical press of Belgrade. But the immediate danger was not one of foreign, but of civil war. The two levies of the militia were called out for drill at the end of August, but instead of being sent home, as usual, it was announced that the exercises would be resumed on October 5, shortly after the date fixed for the elections, and that more men would then have to join the colours. Meanwhile the militia were allowed to retain their arms, which they had not done since the revolt of Zaitschar in 1883. Fortunately the elections passed off without any serious disturbance, the Radicals coming in with a majority of 94 to 22.

On July 24 the ex-King Milan, who had been staying for some time at Constantinople, paid a visit to Belgrade. He conferred with M. Ristitch and the chief members of the Cabinet, but did not show himself in public, and left his former

capital a few days after. Meanwhile Queen Natalie continued to press for an interview with her son, and on August 18 it was announced that the ex-King had given his consent to her visiting her son at Belgrade; but it was found impossible, after much negotiation, to induce the ex-Queen to agree to any conditions as to her future relations with him. She arrived on September 30, and was welcomed with great enthusiasm by the people, though there was no official reception. The negotiations between her and the Ministry were now resumed, but she insisted on her right to reside in Servia and to see her son. The situation was critical, for the ex-Queen was very popular, and though the Radical Ministry had an overwhelming majority, they could not afford to brave public opinion. After she had been in the capital nearly a fortnight the Regents had to give way, and the young King, escorted by his tutor and aide-de-camp, visited her in her house. M. Ristitch was evidently anxious to avoid all pretexts for a collision, both at home and abroad. He was formerly supposed to be a partisan of Russia, but he now sedulously held aloof from all compromising engagements, both towards the Government of St. Petersburg and its rival at Vienna. Thus Servia prudently maintained a neutral attitude, while her neighbour, Montenegro, following the example of Greece, strengthened her position with Russia by matrimonial alliances between the reigning families. On June 16 the Grand Duke Paul, brother of the Czar, was married to the Princess Alexandra of Greece, and on July 21 the Grand Duke Peter Nikolayevitch was married to the Princess Militza of Montenegro.

The chief event in Roumania during the year was the notification on April 25 that Prince Ferdinand of Hohenzollern had been proclaimed heir-presumptive to the Roumanian Crown, and had accordingly assumed the official title of his Royal Highness Prince Ferdinand of Roumania. The Coalition Ministry passed through a series of crises which seriously disturbed the machinery of Government. The first occurred on January 24, when the motion of the Conservative leader, M. Catargi, for the re-establishment of the free ports of Braila and Galatz was rejected by a majority of 110 to 56. As the Coalition Ministry contained three Conservative members who voted with the other ministers in the majority, this caused a dangerous split in the Conservative Party, and the situation was still further aggravated by the fact that in the majority were some well-known partisans of Russia, such as MM. Blarenberg and Cogalniceano. On February 21 another debate took place which broke up the Ministry. M. Blarenberg having proposed a motion for the impeachment of the ex-Minister M. Bratiano, 80 voted for the motion and 81 against it. The "Yunimist" ministers (*see* ANNUAL REGISTER, 1888, p. 305) were in the course of this debate violently attacked by their colleague, the Minister of

Justice, Vernesco, and after some scandalous scenes the motion was passed on Feb. 21 by a majority of 101 to 41, and a commission was appointed to inquire into the charges made against M. Bratiano. The Cabinet lingered on six weeks longer, and then resigned (April 3). The immediate cause of this event was the appointment by the Minister of Justice of some judges who were stated to be his personal friends, which led the courts of justice to suspend their sittings, the other judges refusing to sit with those appointed by the Minister. This deadlock thus produced might have been removed by the Minister's resignation; but the coalition of the Unionists and old Conservatives had long proved unworkable, and M. Vernesco having refused to resign alone, the Premier took the opportunity of bringing about the resignation of the entire Cabinet. The situation had indeed become very perilous. The attacks in the press on the King had become more bitter than ever, and a new paper, the "*Adeverul*" (Truth) was started, which daily published scandalous accusations against him and speedily obtained a large circulation. Although the Parliament had been sitting since Nov. 1, 1888, the only measures that had been passed were the adoption of a gold currency and a Bill for the sale of the State lands to the peasants, which was so mutilated by the Conservative Minister Lahovary that it became a dead letter. As for the Budget, which should have come into force on April 1, it had not been voted.

After much negotiation with the party leaders the King induced M. Lascar Catargi, the leader of the old Conservatives, to form a Ministry (April 11). M. Catargi had brought about the first commercial treaty with Austria, and his sympathies were rather Austrian than Russian. M. Vernesco, who was the cause of the fall of the late Ministry, in which he was Minister of Justice, now became Minister of Finance; and M. Lahovary, an advocate of alliance with France and Russia, obtained the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. The new Ministry, however, though composed entirely of Conservatives, was as disunited as its predecessor. Its chief members, MM. Catargi, Vernesco, and Lahovary, each sought to obtain a large personal following, so as ultimately to dominate the other Ministers. The most ambitious of the three was M. Lahovary, who distributed numerous places among his adherents and took every opportunity of exposing the incapacity of the Premier, M. Catargi. M. Vernesco, however, continually opposed him, and the Premier took advantage of the disputes between his colleagues to maintain himself in power. He was strongly supported by M. Hitrovo, the Russian representative, who persuaded the anti-dynastic boyars that had never ceased to chafe at the presence of a German prince on the Roumanian throne to gather round M. Catargi and defend him against the attacks of his fellow Ministers in the hope that he would direct the policy of

Roumania in accordance with the wishes of Russia. The disputes between the Ministers, however, became so bitter that M. Catargi was forced to resign (Nov. 15), and General Mano, the Minister for War, was entrusted with the formation of a new Cabinet. The new Premier did not share the Russian proclivities of some of his former colleagues, but the Russophile M. Lahovary retained the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, which he had occupied in the former Ministry, and M. Rosetti, the President of the late Yunimist Ministry Coalition Cabinet, became Minister of Justice (Nov. 16). The new Ministry was thus a mixture of members of various parties, as the Catargi Ministry had been, and it did not promise to be any more long-lived. It was put to a severe test at the end of the year, when the Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider the question of the impeachment of the late Bratiano Cabinet presented its report. It proposed the impeachment of no fewer than seven former Roumanian Ministers, MM. Joan Bratiano, Demeter Stourdza, Aurelian, Constantin Nacu, and Eugen Stasesco, and Generals Mihai and Cernat, all of whom were accused of having acted dishonestly by the funds of the State.

It was generally admitted that M. Joan Bratiano during his twelve years' tenure of office allowed his colleagues to use the Secret Service money entirely according to their own judgment, and it came out at the trial of the brothers Maican in the previous year that there had been mismanagement in the Roumanian War Office under some of the War Ministers in the different Cabinets of which Mr. Bratiano was chief. On the other hand, nobody believed that Mr. Bratiano himself had been guilty of peculation, but against the above-mentioned members of his successive Cabinets the Roumanian Opposition brought forward incredible accusations, as a specimen of which may be mentioned the case of General Mihai, who was Home Minister under M. Bratiano. He was once accused in a public meeting by Deputy Gradisteanu of having appropriated a valuable gold watch that had been stolen from Captain Vacarescu. This assertion was corroborated by the Captain himself in a letter addressed to the Opposition papers, and the writer added that General Mihai had sold this watch to M. Cogalniceanu, one of the best known Roumanian statesmen. At the same time General Mihai was accused of having also appropriated five hundred thousand francs out of the public moneys destined for election purposes.

On the ground of these assertions Deputy Filipescu called General Mihai a thief in a public sitting of the Chamber. M. Eugen Stasesco, again, who was once Minister of Justice, was accused in Parliament by Deputy Majorescu, himself subsequently Minister of Public Instruction under M. Rosetti, of having encouraged the judges in acts of bribery and corruption.

The general feeling of the country, however, was strongly opposed to these scandalous proceedings, and the further consideration of the report was indefinitely postponed.

One of the chief difficulties with which Roumania, like the other small States on the Danube, had to contend was the incessant agitation of Russian Pan Slavist agents. The chief of these was M. Hitrovo, the Russian Consul at Bucharest, who was in constant communication with Russian agents in Bulgaria and Servia. In Roumania especially numerous agents were constantly travelling about the country in the guise of hawkers, who proceeded from village to village selling portraits of the Czar and stirring the peasants against the Government. A decree was issued for the expulsion of these so-called hawkers, and M. Hitrovo used all his influence, though unsuccessfully, to procure the withdrawal of this measure. He also induced the Opposition to protest against the proposed construction of fortifications on the line from Galatz to Fokshani, and strove to obtain the consent of the Government to the passage of Russian troops through the Dobrudscha in the event of a war. The declaration in April of Prince Bismarck's organ, the "*Nord-deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*," that Germany takes no more interest in Roumania than in Bulgaria, greatly assisted M. Hitrovo in these machinations by spreading a belief that Roumania would not find any effectual support among the Powers in resisting the Russian demands; but the Bulgarian Chamber notwithstanding this adopted, by 110 votes to 51, a credit of 15,000,000 francs for new fortifications round Bucharest (April 17). Another incident which caused much dissatisfaction among the Pan Slavists was the proclamation of Prince Ferdinand of Hohenzollern as Crown Prince of Roumania (April 6) in conformity with Article 83 of the Constitution, which requires that, in the event of the King not having any direct male heirs, the crown should pass to the son of his eldest brother. As the German dynasty in Roumania was the chief obstacle to the extension of Russian influence, this arrangement for securing the succession was naturally viewed with much displeasure at St. Petersburg.

CHAPTER IV.

MINOR STATES OF EUROPE.

- I. BELGIUM. II. NETHERLANDS. III. SWITZERLAND. IV. SPAIN.
V. PORTUGAL. VI. DENMARK. VII. NORWAY. VIII. SWEDEN.

I. BELGIUM.

The strikes that had marked the course of 1887 had brought to light the serious symptom that the working classes were in possession of a powerful organisation, and implicitly obeyed the orders of their leaders. This same symptom was again noticeable in 1888, although the strikes that broke out during that year had not seemed of an unusually alarming character. These strikes, however, were to be brought before the courts of justice,

to a most strange and unexpected termination, which constitutes by far the most interesting feature of Belgium's political history during the present year.

At the close of 1888 the workmen of the central mining districts of Charleroi, Mons, and the Borinage had held an important congress, in the course of which the most revolutionary measures had been proposed and adopted. The plan was to provoke a general strike of all the workmen of the above-mentioned districts, so as to oblige the Government to send to the spot a large number of troops as on previous occasions, and profiting by the momentary absence of a considerable part of the garrison, to march in armed bands against Brussels, to destroy the principal public buildings, to overthrow the Government and the King, and to proclaim the republic. In conformity with this plan, numerous attacks were made against property, and in different parts of the country private and public establishments were destroyed or damaged by dynamite cartridges. The general plan, as might be expected, proved a failure, and its principal authors were indicted before a jury, for attempting to overthrow the existing form of government and to bring about civil war. Foremost amongst the accused was a certain Laloi, well known as one of the principal leaders of the working men, and one who had attracted special notice by the violence of his provocations and his advocacy of armed revolt. Great was therefore the surprise when it turned out that this Laloi was but a common spy, who had played the part of *agent-provocateur*, and had betrayed to the detective police all the resolutions that had been formed, and the plans that had been adopted in the various meetings of the workmen. Although he had no official connection with the police administration, his services were fully appreciated and proportionately rewarded.

Fresh and still more important revelations followed by degrees, and finally led to the arrest of another *agent-provocateur*, named Pourbaix, who was accused of having, with criminal intent, furnished considerable quantities of dynamite to recognised anarchists, and having, even more openly than Laloi, urged the working classes to acts of violence and crime. But the fact that created the greatest sensation throughout the country was that this scoundrel was in frequent communication with some of the Ministers at Brussels. He had been officially recommended to the Administration of Public Safety in 1887 by M. Devolder, then Minister of Justice. It was also clearly proved that he had had interviews with the Prime Minister, M. Beernaert. The most serious part of the machinations thus gradually brought to light was the disclosure of the fact that, in view of enabling the Government to arrest the principal leaders of the workmen, Pourbaix had presented M. Beernaert with an ultimatum which was to be supposed to have been written by a workman, and in which it was stated that if the Government did not grant the

workmen's demand for universal suffrage civil war would be the consequence. This manifesto, moreover, was full of appeals to the working classes to rebel and to overthrow the existing order of things. This document was put into M. Beernaert's hands by Pourbaix himself one night in the Minister's apartment. M. Beernaert, having perused it, observed that without signature it would be worthless, and requested Pourbaix to get it signed by a representative of the working men. The ultimatum was then forwarded to the Administration of Public Safety, together with a written note of the Minister's, requesting it to be sent on without any delay to Pourbaix. The latter, without difficulty, managed to get it signed by an unfortunate youth of twenty, who probably did not foresee the consequences of his act, and it was then sent by Pourbaix for publication in one of the daily political papers. Hereupon, and as if he had hitherto known nothing of the document, the Minister called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the ultimatum, and Conreur, who had imprudently signed it, although under a false name, was arrested and brought before the jury for having excited the workmen to rebellion.

The sensation produced by these successive revelations was unprecedented when the public learnt with amazement that the Ministers had been in direct and personal relations with *agents-provocateurs* of the most dangerous kind. Special indignation, too, was aroused by the fact that, knowing that the ultimatum had been signed by one who had had nothing to do with drawing it up, and who was therefore innocent, the Ministers had nevertheless caused him to be prosecuted. Public opinion, moreover, sternly insisted on the immediate arrest of Pourbaix, who was the real stirrer-up of rebellion, and censured the Minister for not having prevented him from inducing the unfortunate Conreur to sign the manifesto, by which the latter had rendered himself liable to the most severe penalties.

The jury reflected the indignation of the public by acquitting all those accused in connection with the revolutionary movement in which Laloi had been implicated shortly after, and by another jury Conreur also was acquitted; whilst Pourbaix, who, independently of the odious part he had played, was convicted of having employed dynamite for criminal purposes, was condemned to two years' imprisonment.

In short, the whole affair was far from turning to the advantage and honour of the Belgian Ministry, who stood convicted, before public opinion, of having resorted to unscrupulous and dishonest means in order to foment riots which, if things had not come to light, they would have taken the credit of repressing, and of restoring calm and security to the country. Public indignation found an expression in the Chamber of Representatives, where two of the most distinguished members of the Liberal party, M. Bara and M. Janson, eloquently and severely stigma-

tised the Government for their conduct. Seldom had the Belgian Parliament witnessed such violent scenes as those that marked this debate. As was, however, inevitable in view of the state of parties, the Ministry remained in power, the Catholic majority solidly voting an order of the day in favour of the Cabinet.

Nevertheless the position of the Government and of the majority in the Chamber had been shaken by the publication of these facts. This was evident in the by-elections that occurred in the course of the year, both for the Senate and the Chamber of Representatives. Of all these elections the most important by far was that at Brussels. Here the conduct of the Government constituted the only question before the electors, M. Beer-naert himself having publicly declared, in answer to the attacks made upon him in the Chamber, that the electoral body of Brussels would avenge him. In answer to this challenge, the Liberal candidate, M. Janson, was returned by 10,589 against 8,602 votes given to his Catholic competitor. This same election had, moreover, from another point of view, considerable significance, giving hope of a speedy reconciliation between the two fractions of the Liberal party at Brussels, whose protracted schism alone had been the cause of the late electoral victories of the Catholic party.

Great as was the impression created throughout the country by the proceedings of the Government in the Pourbaix affair, another question, the revision of the electoral law, aroused the hostility of both provincial and communal electors. The last Liberal Cabinet, although maintaining the electoral rating, had given the right of vote to all citizens whose educational attainments were patent, by reason of the position they held or the functions they discharged. The new Bill, whilst diminishing the former rating qualification, suppressed almost completely all the electors "by right" called into existence by the former Government. Amongst others who would be deprived of their right of vote were the Ministers, the members of the Chamber of Representatives, and of the provincial and communal councils, professors and teachers, officers of the army, &c. This proposal met with violent opposition on the part of all the educated classes of the country, but at the close of the year it remained without any modification as an order of the day to be submitted to the Chamber of Representatives.

The military question also continued to greatly occupy public attention. Several pamphlets, some of which were thought to have been written under the direct inspiration of King Leopold, were published in favour of and also against personal service; but, in spite of the keenness of the discussions, no definite result was arrived at. The Liberal party for many years has endeavoured to introduce the system of personal military service, but it has been energetically opposed by almost the whole of the

Catholic party. All the highest Belgian military authorities, and amongst them the Minister of War, strongly urge the adoption of this system, as being not only just and equitable, but also indispensable to the future welfare and existence of the country; but hitherto they have not succeeded in bringing the Catholics to adopt their views.

In the last days of December the most important strike ever witnessed in Belgium broke out in the coal district of Charleroi, 24,000 colliers out of the total number of about 28,000 refusing to continue to work under the existing conditions of wages. These strikes, however, widely differed from those that had broken out in preceding years, the workmen making no attempt to riot, but simply claiming, with calm persistence, that the evils of which they justly complained should be redressed. In a word, absolutely nothing of an anarchist nature marked the strike, which the closing year left unsettled, and the greatest order prevailed throughout the entire district.

II. THE NETHERLANDS.

The chief events of the year were the measures that had to be taken in consequence of the almost desperate state of health of King William III., whose death was for weeks almost daily apprehended. It will be remembered that, in case of the King's death during his daughter's minority, the Chambers had decided that Queen Emma was to be invested with the duties of regent. Moreover, Article 88 of the Dutch Constitution, foreseeing the case of the King being unable to exercise his prerogative, from any cause whatever, declared that, in such a case, the Council of State might, with the assent of both Chambers, exercise a temporary regency, on condition that, within the delay of one month, the States-General should proceed to the election of a provisional regent. Queen Emma having been already designated regent in case of the King's death, she was evidently the most suitable person to whom could be confided the duties of a temporary regency. For a long time, however, the Queen hesitated to accept the responsibility, preferring to devote herself entirely to the care of the King. At last, however, after the Prime Minister, Baron Mackay, had officially proclaimed before the Chambers that the King was wholly unable to reign, she suffered herself to be convinced; and the States-General (April 3), according to Article 40 of the Constitution, invested the Council of State with the duties of temporary regency for the space of one month.

This delay was about to expire, and the States-General had already been informed of the day when they should assemble in order to pass the Bill conferring the provisional regency on the Queen during the King's illness, when, by a sudden and most unhopèd-for change, the aged monarch's health improved so

rapidly that after a very few days he was once more enabled to exercise the royal power. Thereupon the States-General at once decided unanimously that the temporary regency was ended and the King was reinstalled in his previous prerogative, the case foreseen by Article 38 of the Constitution having ceased to exist.

The happy event was celebrated throughout the whole country with the greatest enthusiasm, clearly proving how strong and deep were the ties by which the Dutch nation was united to the house of Orange; and the rejoicings were the greater as marking the year in which William III. celebrated the fortieth anniversary of his elevation to the throne.

Other questions, however, also occupied public attention, and foremost amongst these was the question of primary instruction, which had for several years been under discussion in the Chambers. The Minister of the Interior, Baron Mackay, in giving notice of the Government Bill on this matter, declared that it was actually impossible to introduce into Holland the principle of obligatory instruction as demanded by the Liberals, inasmuch as this question could not be thoroughly discussed before a complete and definitive labour law had been adopted. The main point of the new law was to put public and private teaching upon an equal footing. In view of obtaining this object, the Bill proposed, that the State should subsidise all schools, private or public, numbering above twenty-five scholars, following the course of study established by the law, and under the direction of a teaching body recognised by the State. Although this Bill was far from giving satisfaction to all the aspirations of the Liberal party, it was accepted by them and finally passed by 71 against 27 votes. What specially called for notice was that, while the Liberals failed to carry this principle of gratuitous and obligatory instruction, which had been rejected by 46 against 38 votes, they nevertheless did not withdraw their general support from the Bill. Seventeen members of the Liberal party voted for the measure with the Conservatives, openly declaring that the true interest of the country dictated their vote in favour of a law of which they did not wholly approve. The adoption of the new measure, they hoped, would put an effectual stop to the misunderstanding which had so long reigned between the two parties and had prevented the passing of so many useful measures.

The military question continued during the year to attract public attention, and various more or less important manifestations in favour of personal service took place. Moreover, the Royal Commission appointed to prepare the legal organisation of military service published a report, proposing that the force of the army should be composed of a minimum of 110,000 men, and that the civic guards should be organised upon a new footing, including a landwehr of 50,000 men and a reserve. The com-

mission also proposed that personal service should be adopted, and that every man should be made liable to perform military duties, the exceptions being made in favour of ecclesiastics, only sons, and of one half of the sons of the same family.

A rather sharp electoral contest took place (May) for the renewal of one half of the provincial councils, but the results were insignificant. The Conservatives gained a certain number of seats in the rural districts, but on the other hand they lost several in the large towns, amongst others at The Hague. In this city, too, an election for a member of the second chamber also turned to the advantage of the Liberal party, whose candidate was elected by 2,886 votes against 2,493 given to M. Du Tour, a Conservative, and formerly Minister of Justice in the Heemskerk Cabinet.

The adoption by the Chambers of a factory law regulating the work of women and children was one of the important achievements of the year. Henceforth, no child under twelve years of age can be employed in the Netherlands; the day's work must not be of more than eleven hours for women and children under sixteen; night work is also forbidden for women and children under fourteen; and the right to Sunday rest is legally enforced.

In spite of the solicitude thus shown for the working classes, the Socialist agitation which had shown itself on various occasions in preceding years was not abandoned. A somewhat serious strike broke out amongst the Rotterdam dockers, becoming at one time sufficiently important to necessitate an active and energetic intervention of the police, during which several of the strikers were wounded, though happily no loss of life had to be deplored.

In the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg the precarious state of the King's health necessitated, as in Holland, the adoption of special measures. In case of the King's death, the regent long since designed had been the Grand Duke Adolphus of Nassau. During the King's illness the appointment of a regency seemed inevitable. The Chambers met and discussed the matter, and after an interview between M. Eyschen, the Minister of State of the Grand Duchy, and the Grand Duke of Nassau, it was decided that this latter should assume the powers of regent as soon as the States-General of Holland should have pronounced the King's temporary incapacity.

The choice of the Duke of Nassau as regent was in every respect strictly in accordance with the famous family pact signed on June 30, 1783, between all the princes of the houses of Orange and Nassau. The treaty of London of March 11, 1867, recognised this pact, Article I. declaring that all the rights of the princes of Nassau to the succession are maintained. No treaty whatever could annul this family pact, which was explicitly recognised in the Luxemburg constitution of 1868, Article 3 of

which declared that "the crown of the Grand Duchy was hereditary in the family of Nassau, according to the pact of 1783." No choice of a regent could therefore have been better than that of the Duke Adolphus of Nassau, who forthwith caused a message to be read before the Chambers, informing them that, as the King had been pronounced momentarily incapable of reigning, he requested to be admitted to take the constitutional oath. This was at once unanimously granted by the Chambers, and the ceremony was performed in French, for many years the official language of the Grand Duchy. In spite of his German connections, the new regent met with a most cordial and enthusiastic welcome.

The regency, however, did not last long, and as soon as the King was restored to health, the Grand Duke officially intimated his readiness to abdicate his functions, if such were the royal wish. The King's answer having been most categorically affirmative, the Chambers declared that the regency of the Grand Duke was ended, and Adolphus of Nassau took leave of the population where he had already gained universal esteem and sympathy.

Nor was this the only question that awoke public attention in the Grand Duchy, for great excitement was caused by the news that Germany was creating an important strategical railway centre at Trois-Vierges, and proposed to construct a railway between Trois-Vierges and Saint Vith. It will be remembered that since 1871, in spite of all the efforts of the Luxemburg Government, certain lines of railway in the Grand Duchy have been managed by the Alsace-Lorraine administration. With these lines in the hands of Germany, and with the newly constructed line and station, the German staff would be in a position to transport with all speed to Trois-Vierges the troops stationed in the Rhenan and Westphalian provinces, if, in case of war against France, the neutrality of the Grand Duchy came to be violated. The line *viâ* Luxemburg and Thionville being by far the shortest route from the Eifel to Metz, it was not surprising that some uneasiness should be felt in the Grand Duchy in view of future eventualities.

In the Dutch colonies, in spite of a fresh attempt at mutiny at Atchin, the situation may be considered as satisfactory, and new measures have been adopted to improve the situation at Surinam.

III. SWITZERLAND.

An international incident of slight importance in itself, but which at one time wore a serious aspect, occurred this year, and created much anxiety throughout the country. Towards the end of April a police inspector of Mulhouse, Herr Wohlgemüth, was arrested at Rheinfelden, in the canton of Aargau, on the charge of having attempted to continue in Switzerland the practices of the German *agents-provocateurs* which had already been brought

to light in the preceding year. An exchange of views between the Swiss Minister of Justice and the German Minister at Berne ensued, the latter energetically claiming the immediate release of a German subject. This, however, the Swiss Government refused to concede until the facts should have been completely brought to light. The subsequent inquiry proved that Wohlgemuth had committed on Swiss territory acts of a nature to compromise Switzerland's internal security. Amongst other things he had engaged another German inhabiting Switzerland, named Lütz, and had directed him to foment a Socialist agitation amongst the working classes of the canton of Bâle, writing to him "to act without any scruple."

These facts having been proved beyond all doubt, the Federal Council released Wohlgemuth, but at the same time expelled him and his accomplice Lutz from Swiss territory. This measure was the more justifiable, as the documents obtained by the Argovian authorities clearly proved that Wohlgemuth had for some time past been carrying on his intrigues in Switzerland, and that on several occasions he had attempted to ally himself with the Socialists. Moreover, he himself openly admitted, at the German Foreign Office when called upon to give explanations, that he had crossed the Rhine in order to fulfil his duties as an agent of the police; an act which alone would have been sufficient to justify the measure taken against him. As to the hardships to which he was said by a part of the German press to have been submitted to during his imprisonment, they were denied by Wohlgemuth himself, and it was admitted by impartial witnesses that the Swiss police had discharged their duty in a strictly legal manner.

Nevertheless, the German Government, affecting to consider the measures taken against Wohlgemuth as contrary to international law, requested the Federal Council to annul the decree of expulsion, threatening, in case of refusal, to adopt on the Swiss frontier measures similar to those in force on the Alsace-Lorraine frontiers. Nor was this a vain threat, for the Federal Council having refused to recognise the German contention, most severe and vexatious measures were taken on the German frontier against all travellers coming from Switzerland; these measures, however, which turned out to inconvenience almost exclusively German travellers, were promptly abandoned, having lasted only a few days. It would, however, be an error to believe that the diplomatic situation had thus been in the least improved; on the contrary, both Governments firmly persisting in their respective opinions. The German Cabinet finally informed the Federal Council that it was useless to pursue any longer negotiations concerning the Wohlgemuth case, and it was even feared for a while that the German Envoy would be recalled from Berne.

In the meantime the Imperial Government took advantage of the prominence given to this affair once more to call attention to

the vexed question of the right of asylum. It will be remembered that a so-called "treaty of establishment" had been concluded on April 27, 1876, between Germany and Switzerland. By Article 2 of the treaty, it was stipulated that all Germans wishing to reside in Switzerland must be possessed, not only of a certificate proving their identity, but also of a certificate of good conduct. When, then, the German Government based the argument that this article obliged Switzerland not to give the right of domicile to persons not certificated, the Federal Council, on the contrary, declared that the article simply gave them the right of refusing to admit certain individuals, but did not in the least imply the obligation of so doing. In point of fact, as the Minister of Justice justly observed at the National Council, if this obligation really did exist, it would imply nothing less than the subordination of the admission of strangers on the Swiss territory to the goodwill of other Governments, and would, in other words, effectually place the right of asylum wholly in their hands, and thus deprive Switzerland of one of the essential attributes of her freedom and of sovereign power within her own territory.

Not content with this assumption of control, Prince Bismarck in a further note declared the necessity for Germany of maintaining her own police in Switzerland, since the Swiss police refused to give sufficient guarantees that the steps taken against Germany's internal security and peace by the Socialists and Anarchists residing in Switzerland would be effectually and sufficiently checked. To this demand the Federal Council replied with great firmness that Switzerland could under no pretence divide with anyone the exercise of police on her own territory, that this was an attribute of her sovereignty that she must keep intact. The Council, moreover, pointed out all agitation contrary to law had always been repressed, and would always be repressed as soon as the facts came to light; and, lastly, that the Swiss Government was quite ready to take all the necessary measures in view of removing defects in the existing legislation.

The Imperial Cabinet declined to accept this solution, and at length, after a rapid exchange of more or less bitter diplomatic notes, denounced the treaty of 1876. In reply to this serious measure, the Federal Council declared that this step would bring about no change whatever in the state of things, since Switzerland would not give up her right of offering asylum to strangers; and in conclusion, the Swiss note ironically reminded the German Cabinet that a few years previously they had requested the Federal Council to invite the cantonal authorities not to apply too severely against German immigrants the provisions of the same treaty.

This difficulty was only finally adjusted quite at the close of the year. In answer to a question put to him at the German Reichstag, Count Herbert Bismarck replied that the affair was definitively settled, both Switzerland and Germany having the same interest

in restricting the power of the Socialists. He added that Germany was by no means opposed to the conclusion of a new "treaty of establishment" with Switzerland, but that there was no need to hurry, the former treaty only expiring on July 20, 1890; and he finally declared that the treaty of 1876 had been denounced by Germany simply because the two Governments did not give the same interpretation to its text.

During these difficult negotiations, the position of the Swiss Government was rendered still more delicate by the fact that, following Germany's example, Russia and Austria also remonstrated against the too wide extension given to the right of asylum, drawing special attention to the shortcomings of the actual laws, and to the necessity for a more stringent supervision of strangers by the Swiss police.

Meanwhile, all the necessary measures for a prompt reform of the actual legislation concerning the right of asylum were being taken by the Federal Council. The right of abode given to political refugees was delivered less freely than before. Several well-known Anarchists, mostly of French nationality, were expelled; lastly, the Swiss Government decided upon the creation of the new post of Attorney-General of the Confederation, whose exclusive duties were to control the settlement of foreigners and to prosecute any refugee whose acts might be considered dangerous to international peace or the safety of foreign Governments, and further to revise the errors the cantonal authorities might commit in police affairs.

This project of law, which was unanimously voted by the National Council, was, as might be expected, greatly opposed by the Swiss Socialists, who demanded that the creation of the new Attorney-General should be submitted to a referendum. But, as had been generally foreseen, they were unable to obtain the 80,000 votes, without which any referendum is impossible. Their demand was, therefore, not taken into consideration. The new law came into operation (Oct. 15), and Herr Scherb, member of the Council of State for the canton of Aargau, was appointed Attorney-General of the Swiss Confederation.

In the course of the diplomatic negotiations certain threatening allusions had been made by Prince Bismarck against the neutrality of Switzerland. Consequently, but without precipitation, the Federal Council took all possible measures to protect, in case of need, the country against such dangers. At the time when the relations between the two countries bore their most menacing aspect, the Swiss Government resolved upon the adoption of new and improved rifles for the army. Public opinion unanimously upheld this proposal, and the Federal Council was authorised to take all necessary measures in view of obtaining as speedily as possible new arms and ammunition, and a credit of 16,000,000 francs was immediately voted for this object. It was, moreover, worthy of notice that throughout the whole course

•

of the negotiations all personal and party questions were put aside, and that both Liberals and Catholics, so greatly divided upon all other questions, unanimously approved the various measures taken by the Federal Council.

Beyond this incident few facts worthy of notice occurred in Switzerland during the year. We must, however, mention a rather serious electoral conflict which arose in the canton of Tessin, where the Catholic Cantonal Government tried to prevent the Liberal electors who were living abroad, and who had come back to take part in the elections, from exercising their right of voting. Serious consequences might have ensued had not the Federal Council threatened the cantonal authorities to send troops to maintain order.

We must also notice the enthusiastic reception given to the King of Italy on the occasion of his journey from Rome to Berlin, which derived more importance from the fact that for some time it was greatly feared that Italy would join Germany in her demands upon Switzerland.

IV. SPAIN.

If Spain were not governed by a regent, and if the Liberal Ministry of Señor Sagasta was not the result of a tacit understanding between parties, the year 1889 might be regarded from a political point of view as a purposeless marking time by party leaders. The great questions inscribed on the programme of the Liberal party had not made a single step towards solution. The equilibrium in the Budget was a matter of luck, and Spain did not follow other European nations in their efforts for colonial expansion. Nevertheless it is necessary to bear in mind the peculiarly delicate situation created in the Iberian Kingdom by the youthfulness of the King, as well as the animosity with which the various political parties regard each other. In the conditions in which the Spanish nation finds itself, it is of great importance that the year should have passed without either a violent crisis or a *pronunciamiento*.

At the opening of the new financial year it seemed that a slight improvement in the condition of both receipts and expenditure was to be hoped for. The ascertained deficit for the year 1886 had been 108 millions of pesetas, of 91 millions in the following year, and of 81 millions only for the year 1888; in view, moreover, of the fact that this last year had been marked by several exceptional events, such as the raising of several Legations to the rank of Embassies, and by the Barcelona Exhibition, there was reason to hope that a stricter administration of public money might ultimately lead to a complete equilibrium. Unfortunately, a series of crises aggravated the situation instead of allowing it to improve itself.

One of the first troubles of the year was a quarrel which

broke out at Valencia between the French Consul and the shippers and exporters of Spanish wines to France. A certain number of these men of business were suspected of lending their aid as intermediaries for the transit of Italian wines destined for Cetté, Marseilles, and Bordeaux. The Consul thereupon refused to grant certificates to exporters of doubtful wines; this act was naturally most prejudicial to the Valencia market. A protest was lodged against the Consul, the export houses of Valencia without distinction of nationality took the part of the complainants, and the French firms established in the city closed their agencies. A certain number of workmen consequently found themselves without work, and expressed their grievances with the violence not uncommon amongst southerners and inhabitants of seaports. After a while the difficulties were smoothed over by concession on both sides.

The death of Marshal Quesada (Jan. 20), one of the most energetic of Spanish generals, although in no way representing ideas of tolerance, nevertheless weakened the Sagasta Ministry. The use of a soldier ready at all times to preserve order soon made itself felt. A banquet was organised by a republican club in Madrid (Feb. 10) to celebrate the sixteenth anniversary of the proclamation of Castelar's ephemeral Republic. Three hundred guests were allowed freely to meet on this occasion, but the sudden appearance of a police officer at the banquet threw everything into confusion, and although everything ended without bloodshed it was a fresh proof of the progress made by the ultra-Liberal party.

The Parliamentary session was from its commencement marked by several skirmishes between the Government and the extreme parties. Señor Sagasta declared (Feb. 16) in strong terms his determination to make considerable reductions in the annual military contingent, and consequently in the military estimates. This proposal naturally aroused the hostility of the generals and their friends in the Cortes, who replied by promptly rejecting the electoral reforms for the West Indies proposed by the Government. Without, however, allowing itself to be distracted by this diversion, the Ministry pushed forward its proposed retrenchments, and the War Minister's Budget was finally adopted (March 2) by the Cortes.

The debate, however, on this question revealed a serious disagreement of opinion between the Ministry and the President of the Cortes, Señor C. Martos. For a time it was hoped that an absolute rupture might be avoided, and with this view a conference was held (March 18) between the chiefs of the different groups which supported the Liberal Ministry—Montaro, Rios, Castelar, the Prime Minister, and the President of the Chamber. These politicians endeavoured to come to an understanding on the course of business during the summer session, but the attempt was not so successful as had been hoped. The public

mind was, moreover, not a little disturbed by the revelations suddenly made with reference to the financial irregularities of the Madrid municipality, and public confidence was seriously shaken when it came to be known that certain of the City Council had enabled their friends to purchase land required for municipal improvements. Once more the rumour of the intended sale of the island of Cuba to the United States was revived, and the Minister of the Interior was questioned in the Senate on the subject; he replied with true Castilian pride that there did not exist in the world sufficient money to purchase the smallest patch of Spanish territory.

The month of April enjoyed the political calm which usually marks that month in Catholic countries, although the Catholics by their congress at Madrid did their utmost to trouble the Pascal truce of parties. The Government declared that it took no part in this affair, and the public followed its example, and the Madrid clericals and others voted in safety addresses condemning the suppression of the temporal power.

On the reassembling of the Cortes the Ministry found itself face to face with real difficulties. The question of universal suffrage so long promised to the Republicans as a reward for their moderation could no longer be postponed. Every precaution was taken which political foresight could suggest to bring the debate to a satisfactory conclusion. A preliminary meeting of the leaders of the Opposition was called together and all undertook not to hinder the debates, and the only anxiety arose from the attitude which the seventy Conservative members might see fit to adopt. In order to expedite the discussion of both the Budget and Suffrage reforms, Señor Sagasta thought fit to imitate the example set by the Italian Chamber of holding two sittings a day. The opposition, however, which this proposal excited, induced him to renounce it, and he thereupon decided to place at the head of the Government business his financial proposals. At the same time, however, he promised to Don Emilio Castelar that under any circumstances a final vote on the Universal Suffrage Bill should be taken before the close of the year. Thus once more it seemed as if the Republicans were allowing themselves to be soothed with fair promises, but their patience on this occasion had a reasonable motive.

The Conservatives as it appeared were no longer agreed on the subject of this constitutional change, and a new grouping of its members seemed imminent. Señor Silvela attempted to form a new Conservative party recruited from all the discontented members of the Right. This group proposed to itself to aid the Ministry in passing the new Suffrage Bill in the hopes that the Liberals would speedily quarrel amongst themselves and thus open the door to the Conservatives.

Happily, time was wanting for the Government to come to terms with its perfidious allies. The Chamber found itself (May

13) plunged in a sharp debate on the question of imposing duties upon corn imported into the kingdom. This proposal, supported by the great landowners and some of the provincial deputies, was violently opposed by the representatives of the large towns and industrial centres. The Minister of Finance, Señor Venancio Gonzalez, appealed to the Chamber to reject the proposal, whilst the Deputies Moret, Puigerver, Gamazo, former Ministers, took a line hostile to the Cabinet, which thereupon called to its rescue all its supporters. The debate took a serious turn, the generals mixing themselves up in it. Don Lopez Dominguez and General Cassola loudly demanded (May 21) a revision of the Customs tariff in a strongly protectionist sense, when suddenly the debates were interrupted by an incident wholly unintelligible to those unacquainted with Spanish habits. On the second day's debate (May 22) the President of the Chamber, Señor Martos, thought fit to refuse the right of speaking to Señor Villaverde, who wished to reply to the Minister of Public Works. On all sides arose loud protestations, ending in such a scene of disorder that the President broke his bell in his vain efforts to calm the assembly. After an interval, however, of a few minutes, during which the sitting had been formally suspended, the debate was resumed under normal conditions. Señor Sagasta then explained fully the economical policy of the Government, and Señor Canovas del Castillo was speaking on behalf of the Right, when suddenly the President rose and quitted the Chamber without a word of explanation; forthwith disorder broke out again in an assembly left without its chairman, and it was not until some time had passed that it transpired that by this act Señor Martos was not only resigning his presidency, but that he intended to offer himself again for election in order to inflict a check upon the Government.

A parliamentary interregnum followed upon this incident, and at length, adopting the advice of the Liberal and Republican press, the Ministry prorogued the Cortes and declared the session at an end. A new session was at the same time announced, being the fifth and last of that parliament. On the reassembling (June 14) of the Cortes the Chamber of Deputies chose for its President, by 237 votes against 117 blanks, Señor Alonso Martinez, former Minister of Grace and Justice, whose place was taken by Señor Canalejas. On the following day Señor Sagasta declared that the Government would stand by all the Bills presented in the preceding session. With the exception of a violent but futile attack (June 18) on the Ministry by Señor Romero Robledo and General Lopez Dominguez, the session proceeded without incident.

The Government commenced by taking a vote on the new tariff to be applied to alcohols. Those imported from foreign countries were to pay a duty of 25 pesetas per hectolitre up to 60°; above that strength a tax of 0.262 peseta per degree,

whilst alcohols made in Spain were to pay 25 pesetas irrespective of the degree of strength. It was remarked that Art. 18 of the Franco-Spanish Treaty of Commerce prevented the application of this tax to French products; but inasmuch as this country exported but little alcohol to the peninsula the matter was considered of no importance. A few weeks later a Bill was passed declaring the construction of a railway between Foix and Lerida of public utility, testifying to the increasing activity of the relations between the two countries.

Meanwhile these purely business discussions were from time to time enlivened by bitter personal disputes. Señor Martos was busily engaged in attempting to raise an opposition against the Government in both Chambers of the Cortes. A violent altercation took place in the corridor of the Chamber between the President of the Council and Senator Marquis Sardoal, to whom Señor Martos had repeated incorrectly certain expressions made use of by Señor Sagasta in the Tribune.

Outside the walls of Parliament few incidents call for notice. The rapid extension of smuggling in Catalonia forced the Government to adopt energetic measures, but in a conflict which took place in the streets of Barcelona between the Custom House officers and the *contrabandistas* the mob sided with the latter and serious rioting ensued. About the same time a vote of the Seville Municipality almost involved the Queen's Government in an international trouble. By a unanimous vote of the Town Council an asylum was offered to the Pope in case he might wish to quit Rome. Cardinal Rampolla dexterously parried the difficulty by simply sending in reply the Holy Father's blessing to the devout city; but Barcelona and Valencia, following the example of Seville, gave to the Catholic Congress at Madrid an importance it had not acquired at the time of its meeting.

In the course of the autumn the danger of a fresh quarrel with Morocco appeared upon the horizon. A Spanish merchant ship, the *Miguel-y-Teresa*, was seized and pillaged by the Riff Moors, not far from the Spanish guard-house of Alhucemar; the crew were kept prisoners several weeks, and were only given up at length on the threat of the Spanish Government to intervene by force. The Opposition journals naturally took advantage of the opportunity to blame the Minister of Marine for his dilatoriness.

The winter session, preceded by negotiations between the President of the Council and Señor Camajo, was as sterile as it was noisy. Señores Martos and Romero Robledo, having definitely settled the terms of their alliance with the Right, undertook to obstruct parliamentary business, and in this they were wholly successful.

At length arrived the moment for discussing the Bill which was to introduce universal suffrage; but by successive amendments the hostile coalition was able to postpone the final vote.

At one moment they proposed to introduce certain restrictions into the text of the Bill, at another they professed themselves anxious to be more liberal than the Ministry itself. Thus General Cassola demanded the right of voting for all officers, whether on active or retired service, although non-commissioned officers and privates were precluded from voting during their military service. In vain the Government attempted by successive concessions to save the spirit of their Bill, but the year ended without the Chamber having passed a single clause of a Bill which contained 110 clauses. The debate had commenced in the month of May, and this proof of the parliamentary weakness of the Government was insisted upon by its enemies.

A further blow to its stability was given by the republican revolution in Brazil. From this moment several political generals, many of whom held seats in the Cortes, imagined the moment had arrived to upset the civil government of Señor Sagasta and to give greater weight to the military element. The Queen Regent was besieged by numerous personages impatient to take in hand the direction of public affairs. Señor Sagasta, with consummate tact, succeeded in avoiding the crisis which menaced constitutional government in Spain. This crisis, however, would have occurred under the most unfavourable circumstances, seeing that Señor Canovas del Castillo, the only statesman capable of uniting the Conservatives, refused to take up the leadership. Señor Sagasta would thus have been replaced by politicians without authority, and the mere puppets of certain parliamentary groups. He took occasion, therefore, to reconstruct his Cabinet and to sacrifice some of his colleagues to the necessities of parliamentary intrigue. Admiral Arcas, Minister of Marine, was the first to tender (Dec. 10) his resignation, and his example was promptly followed by the Ministers of Finance and Commerce. The Prime Minister put off until the close of the year the reconstruction of his Cabinet, hoping to strengthen his party by detaching some members of the coalition. His negotiations, however, were greatly hindered by the serious illness of the young King, and the year closed with the fear not only of a Ministerial crisis, but also of a change in the representative of the monarchy.

V. PORTUGAL.

In opening the legislative session (Jan. 2) the King of Portugal found occasion to speak of the sympathetic reception which he had met with during his absence from the country. The Speech from the Throne further announced a reform of the electoral law with regard to the Chamber of Deputies, an increase of both the army and navy, and the establishment of new trading posts in Africa.

The debate on the Address was very animated. A former

Minister of Marine, Senhor Vilhena, violently attacked the Ministerial policy as showing too much deference to both Germany and Great Britain. This attitude of the Opposition testified to the extreme susceptibility of all Portuguese parties on matters connected with African policy.

Although this feeling reappeared on various occasions during the year, and towards its close produced a serious crisis, it did not at first present itself as a stumbling-block to the Ministry. After having passed without damage through the annual trial of the debate on the Address, the Cabinet found itself forced (Feb. 20) to remodel itself on account of a purely commercial question. It had been decided that the Government should acquire the monopoly of the exportation of port wines, and this business, by far the most important in the kingdom, was to be handed over to a company.

On all sides protests and opposition were raised against the proposal; Senhores Marianno, de Carvalho, and Navarre, the three Ministers most compromised, were obliged to resign. From a political point of view these changes had no importance, for the power still remained in the hands of the Progressistas.

The new members of the Cabinet were (Feb. 23) Senhor J. Bessano Garcia, who became Minister of Marine and the Colonies; Senhor José Coelho, Public Works, Trade, and Commerce; and Senhor H. Barros Gomez, who undertook the Ministry of Finance in addition to his duties at the Foreign Office. At this juncture the Portuguese Government was officially invited to take part in the Paris Exhibition. The matter had already been discussed by the Government before the close of the preceding year, and in conformity with the decision then arrived at declined the invitation, although it granted a subvention to the Portuguese Industrial Association. Another association, which took the title of the Central Association of Portuguese Agriculture, undertook to organise at Paris an Exhibition of Agricultural Products with the special view of bringing into notice the various wines of Portugal and to open a large market for the products of the valley of the Douro.

The Portuguese Catholics, following the example of those of France, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, organised at Oporto a congress which voted in favour of the re-establishment of the temporal authority of the Pope. Whilst the Catholics were debating the Revolutionists thought of acting, and the Anarchist party gave proof of its existence by throwing a bomb into the Government buildings. No loss of life followed on this criminal attempt, but it proved that in Portugal, as in the larger States, the same passions existed.

Meanwhile Africa was more and more attracting public attention. On the north-west coast Portuguese sailors had been attacked by the Moors at Casabianca. The Government, in common with the Madrid Cabinet, made formal and joint

representations to the court at Morocco, and after some delay the matter was satisfactorily arranged. A far more serious difficulty was gathering in the Zambesi district. The well-known African traveller, Major Serpa Pinto, left Lisbon (March 24) for Delagoa Bay, accompanied by the engineer Castellões. His instructions were to officially take possession of the territories claimed by Portugal in Southern Africa. Immediately on his arrival he perceived that since his previous journey English influence had made enormous strides, and a conflict in the centre of Africa between the British traders and Portuguese troops seemed inevitable. In order to give more strength and vigour to the efforts of the Colonial Government an understanding was arrived at amongst the chiefs of the various political parties and a somewhat theatrical demonstration was arranged in the Chamber of Peers at Lisbon. Senhor Serpa Pimental, the leader of the Conservative Opposition, brought a resolution asserting once more the rights of Portugal in Eastern and Central Africa, and inviting the Government to maintain them without flinching. The resolution was signed by the chiefs of all parties, Senhores Barjona, Hitze, San Tamario, Macedo, and Thomas Ribiro. The Minister replied by expressing his conviction that the rights of Portugal would not be disregarded by any Power, and the motion was adopted unanimously. This manifestation had probably no other aim than to give warning to the conquerors of the Black Continent.

The King, Dom Luis, was not destined to see the end of the coming imbroglio. Gravely attacked by a cruel disease, he lingered throughout the summer and died (Oct. 9) at the comparatively early age of fifty-one years. No opposition or crisis marked the succession of his eldest son, Dom Carlos.

Scarcely, however, was the new sovereign installed than two events of exceptional importance took place. The revolution in Brazil extinguished a throne of the House of Braganza and gave a powerful impulsion to the Republican party in Spain. At the beginning of the century constitutional monarchy had, by the voluntary abdication of Pedro I., come from Brazil to Portugal, and men asked if at the close of the century it might not be from Brazil that the Republic with Pedro II. might come to Portugal. The progress made by Republicanism in the country promptly made itself known; whilst such journals as *O Secolo* and *Los Debates*, of Lisbon, and *O Jolha*, of Oporto, openly pushed the propaganda in the army, the cities of Lisbon and Oporto returned Republican members to the Chamber. The jurist Trofilo Braga, aided by the editor of *O Secolo*—Senhor Magahles Lima—worked together in giving a steady support to the party. Their efforts had an international importance out of proportion to the influence of Portugal in Europe, for the fall of the House of Braganza at Lisbon would be a serious warning to other monarchies.

The other cause of embarrassment was the action of Major Serpa Pinto in Africa. With colonial troops thoroughly armed he attacked the territory of the Makololos and forced those blacks to recognise a Portuguese protectorate. The news of his success brought about the formation at Lisbon of the Portuguese South African Company, claiming rights over Mashonoland and Makololand. A conflict of interests between this company and an English company having similar objects at once arose, and Senhor Barros Gomez, notwithstanding his shrewdness and intelligence, failed to realise the gravity of the situation, and the attitude to be adopted by his Government.

The financial situation of Portugal during the year 1889-90 seemed at first sight somewhat precarious. The total expenditure was placed at 44 millions of contos, and the receipts at 40 millions only. The floating debt, of which the conversion was inevitable, exceeded two millions of contos. But no satisfactory steps were taken to face these financial difficulties, which came so inopportunately to complicate the dynastic and international troubles.

VI. DENMARK.

Denmark had not for some time passed through such a quiet year politically as 1889. It seemed as if the people, after the great excitement and bustle of the previous year's great exhibition at Copenhagen, and after the disappointment they had experienced in the settlement of their political difficulties, needed a year of "rest and reflection." The disappointment in their home politics consisted, it may be remembered, in the failure of the attempt on the part of certain Liberals to inaugurate a new policy which might enable the country to put an end to the political deadlock of fifteen years' standing. Instead of curtly refusing to consider all Government Bills, it was proposed that advances should be made to the Government with the view of compromising matters and of permitting the Rigsdag to pass a lawful Budget and other important measures. But this so-called policy of "discussion" proved as futile and disastrous as the old "withering" policy of the Liberals, and the Conservative Government continued in the meantime to rule the country in the same firm but rather high-handed way which had gone on since 1875.

When the Rigsdag adjourned for the Christmas holidays (1888) no report had been made by the Budget Committee to the Folkething (the Lower House), whilst nearly all the other Government Bills had similarly been referred to committees, so that it seemed as if the "withering" policy was again to be revived, although not openly acknowledged. A belief, moreover, got abroad among Liberals that the Lower House would be dissolved at an early date. They accordingly, perhaps, gave less serious attention to the various Bills before them than under

other circumstances might have been the case. No sign of dissolution, however, appeared, and as members could not very well return home to their electors with no record of any work accomplished, they eventually applied themselves to the business of legislation, and passed a goodly number of minor measures before the close of the session. The Budget Committee, however, showed no willingness to make concessions to the Government, either with regard to the grant for the fortifications round Copenhagen or to the maintenance of the gendarmerie, which had been called into existence by a provisional law a few years before. The Government on its part, however, made an approach to a compromise on the latter question, proposing to establish a "State police" instead of the gendarmerie, and at one time there was some hope that a good many of the Liberals would have accepted this way out of the difficulty. The proposal, having remained a month before the Folkething, at length came on for discussion, but only to be thrown out on the second reading. No subsequent attempt was made to bring about an agreement on the subject, and it soon became evident that no Budget would be regularly voted. It was, indeed, sent up to the Landsting (the Upper House) towards the end of March, but in such an altered shape that no one expected that it would be accepted by the Government and their supporters. Count Moltke, the President of the Upper House, strongly supported the most important of the grants which the Government had asked for, viz. the 8,000,000 kroner (nearly 500,000*l.*) for the completion of the fortifications which had been begun round the capital. These works had been carried on by the Government on its own responsibility, and the moment of their actual completion was now approaching, although not a single krone had been legally provided for their cost.

As the Rigsdag had not passed the Budget before the expiration of the financial year, the session was closed (April 1), and a new provisional Budget was at once issued by Royal rescript. This was now the fifth year that the Estrup Ministry had resorted to provisional Budgets to carry on the Government. The supporters of the Government maintained that this year's irregularity was due to the tactics of the Liberals, who had not even given the Upper House sufficient time to read the Bill three times, still less to come to some compromise by means of a conference between the two Houses, when it was hoped that a serious attempt to discover a *modus vivendi* might have been made.

During the recess the country enjoyed a most welcome political quietude. The Conservatives held a series of meetings in various parts of the country, and a number of new Conservative associations and clubs were formed. But while the Conservative party was thus organising itself in various ways the Liberals remained in the disunited state into which they had fallen in the previous year (see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1888, page

321-22), and no reconciliation had taken place between the three groups into which this party had been split up. At some of the meetings of the Liberals it was found that Mr. Berg, their former leader and the founder of the "withering" policy, still had supporters in most of the electorates, although they were not numerous enough to become dangerous to the other section of the party which opposed his policy.

Early in October a conference of delegates from all the Liberal associations in the country, similar to the one held in the previous year, took place at Copenhagen. At this conference it was found that about one-third of the delegates were friendly to Mr. Berg, but their deliberations did not assist much in bringing about the greatly desired reconciliation of the various factions; in fact, some of the Liberals began to object to the position taken up by this "Over-Rigsdag," as these conferences were called by the other party.

On the reassembling of the Rigsdag (Oct. 7) little hope was entertained that any practical business would be transacted. The Liberals were evidently anxious not to commit themselves to anything which could be made use of by their opponents at the general elections for the Folkething in the ensuing spring. The Government laid a great number of Bills before the Rigsdag, nearly all of which had been before it in the former session. In addition to the Budget and the Supplementary Estimates for the fortifications of the capital, a Bill for the erection of a naval fort outside Copenhagen was introduced into the Lower House; but with these measures little or no progress had been made when the year closed. Most of the Government proposals had been read a first time, and a number of committees appointed to report upon them, but no conclusion had been come to on any of the more important and urgent measures. The Budget Committee had not even made its report by the end of the year, and it seemed improbable that an agreement would be come to upon the reassembling of the Rigsdag after the new year. A number of private Bills were introduced and discussed, and one of the Liberal leaders, Count Holstein-Ledreborg, proposed a reform in the composition of the "Rigsret" (the Supreme Court of Justice for the trial of political offences). The Liberals would long ago have impeached the present Ministry before this court had not the appointment of the judges of the tribunal been practically in the hands of the Government and the Upper House, and it would, therefore, have been of little use to challenge the conduct of the Ministry before a court consisting principally of its own friends and supporters. As was expected, Count Holstein-Ledreborg's proposal met with no success, a great number of Liberals even opposing it, on the ground, amongst other reasons, that such a proposal admitted that the pivot of the Constitution lay in the "Rigsret" and not in the Folkething.

In the Upper House several important Bills were read a second

time and many minor ones were passed and sent down to the Lower House.

Outside Parliament Mr. Hørup, editor of the Liberal paper *Politiken*, and a prominent member of the Lower House, was imprisoned (Nov. 12) for three months, having been found guilty of libel against the present Burgomaster of Copenhagen, Dr. Sylow. The libel which had appeared in a number of the *Politiken* accused Dr. Sylow of having shown partiality in an action, brought against the newspaper, in which Dr. Sylow had been the judge. Mr. Hørup was to be treated as an ordinary prisoner, and even the privilege of smoking was denied to him.

At the close of the year all political interest in the country was centred upon the coming elections. The Conservatives were very hopeful, especially as they felt that they were entering upon the contest more united and better organised than their opponents, who, by their own waywardness and obstinacy, were split into groups, having no policy in common beyond hostility to the party in office.

VII. NORWAY.

It will be remembered that during the last two or three years there had arisen a general dissatisfaction among the Liberal party in Norway against their old leader, Mr. Johan Sverdrup and his Ministry, whom they had placed in power in 1884 at the close of the long constitutional struggle against the King. After taking office he had repudiated his former principles and had been defeated time after time in the Storting. He nevertheless clung to office, and seemed to take no heed of the parliamentary government he himself had introduced into the country. The small group of Liberals who after the elections of 1888 still supported him numbered only twenty-two, and it was only by the aid of the Conservatives that he was able to obtain a majority in the Storting. It was clear that this state of affairs would not last long, and the present year has at length witnessed, to the great satisfaction of the Advanced Liberals, the downfall of Mr. Sverdrup and his Ministry and the disappearance of Mr. Sverdrup from political life. At the same time the Liberals have had the mortification of seeing a Conservative Government appointed by the King, although there was actually a Liberal majority in the Storting. The Liberals, however, look upon the present state of affairs as only transitory, and anticipate that ere long they will again be in a large majority in the National Assembly.

The Storting as usual assembled (Feb. 1) and proceeded at once to elect the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the two Houses into which the body dissolves itself. After the elections of the previous year the three parties in the Storting were represented by 22 Ministerialists, 38 Advanced Liberals, and 54 Conservatives. Owing to the alliance existing between the Ministerial and Con-

servative groups, the Conservatives succeeded in getting Mr. Stang, their leader, elected President of the Storthing, while the other posts of Presidents and Vice-Presidents were filled by representatives from the different groups. The King in person opened the Storthing (Feb. 8), but the Speech from the Throne gave no indications of any Bills of importance, but several proposals for the improvement of the country and its means of communication were mentioned. The Budget proposed an expenditure of 44,750,000 kroner (2,486,000*l.*) and a revenue slightly in excess of the expenditure.

It will be remembered that the Storthing in 1887, after many years' labour, had passed a Bill for the introduction of the jury system into Norway from Jan. 1, 1890. Soon after the Storthing had assembled this year, it was, however, rumoured that some of the members of the Government and its supporters were willing to combine with the Conservatives, who from the beginning had been opposed to the introduction of the jury system, to postpone or rescind the reform altogether by delaying or refusing the necessary grant of money for its introduction until the necessary revision of the criminal code had taken place. Failing this, they were ready to adopt any pretext which would delay its introduction indefinitely, trusting to being able to turn public opinion against the proposed innovation. A proposal for such a postponement was eventually made by one of the Ministerialists, and was referred to a committee; but when the matter came before the Odelsting (the Lower House or Committee of the Storthing), the various proposals for a postponement were, after three days' discussion, thrown out by 45 against 39 votes. It was thus shown that there was still a Liberal majority in the House which did not altogether repudiate their old principles, and which, under proper leadership, could resist all reactionary attempts. The Ministry took up a very vacillating position in the discussion on this question, and was generally looked upon as sharing the defeat of the Conservatives, having lent itself to upset the great reform which it had cost the Liberal party so much time and labour to carry through. The Government, however, following its tactics of the previous year, did not feel itself called upon to resign on the vote.

Owing to the general dissatisfaction with which the Ministry was regarded, and especially on account of its attitude on the jury question, the advanced Liberals (Feb. 25) proposed a vote of want of confidence in the Government; but this, by a combination of the Ministerialists and the Conservatives, was defeated by 71 against 39 votes.

In March Mr. Aretander, who had resigned his seat in the Sverdrup Ministry in 1888, proposed that the Government should enter into negotiations with the Swedish Government for a reduction in the diplomatic representation of the two kingdoms, and of the expenses connected therewith. Although there was a

general dissatisfaction between the two countries with the present arrangement for the transaction of foreign affairs, Mr. Arcander's proposal was negatived. Soon afterwards an event occurred which clearly proved to the Norwegians the necessity of a better arrangement for the conduct of diplomatic business. In 1888 the Norwegian Government, in reply to a circular addressed to all countries by the French Government, intimated through the Swedish Foreign Minister, who conducts the diplomatic business both for Sweden and Norway, that Norway would take part in the Paris Exhibition in 1889, and soon afterwards the Storting granted 100,000 kroner, instead of 75,000 kroner as proposed by the Government, towards the expenses connected therewith. Shortly before the opening of the exhibition the Norwegian Commissioner requested Count Lewenhaupt, the Swedish and Norwegian Ambassador in Paris, to be present in the Norwegian department in order to receive President Carnot on his tour of inspection through the exhibition on the opening day. The Ambassador replied that he had received orders from the Swedish Foreign Minister at Stockholm not to do so. Sweden was not represented at all at the Paris Exhibition; it was generally known that the King and the Swedish Government looked with displeasure on the proposed celebration of the French Revolution, and had prevented Sweden, much to the disappointment of the Swedish people, from taking part in the Paris Exhibition. It was openly said in the Norwegian papers that Royal influence had also been used to prevent Norway from exhibiting, but in this matter the Norwegian Government and the Storting could act independently of the King. On the day of the opening, therefore, the diplomatic representative of Norway was not present to receive the French President, and the Norwegians in consequence keenly felt the slight put upon them by the Swedish Foreign Minister, Norway paying her share towards the expenses of the diplomatic service, and being officially represented at the expense of the State, had a perfect right to demand the presence of its representative. A considerable amount of ill-feeling was displayed in Norway when these events became known, and the leading Liberal organs commented in strong terms on the conduct of the Ambassador; but as neither he nor the Swedish Foreign Minister was in any way responsible to the Norwegian Storting, no practical steps could be taken to resent the affront.

During the parliamentary session the long talked of educational reform was carried out. A new law for the regulation and supervision of schools in town and in country districts was passed, in spite of the measures taken by the Conservative party to wreck the Bill. The great point on which the Liberals insisted was that the appointment of teachers should be placed upon a more democratic footing, that the schools of the people should be under the direct control of the local representatives of the people, and not under Government or official supervision. One clause

prohibiting Dissenters from becoming teachers at these schools was unfortunately inserted, but it was hoped that another Storting would remove this blot upon an otherwise perfect school law.

In connection with the settlement of the School Laws Mr. Liestol, a member of the Government, resigned, as he could not agree with his colleagues in the new attitude they had taken up on this question. He was later on replaced by Mr. Liljedahl, a schoolmaster and member of the Storting.

Before its adjournment the Storting also made a grant of altogether 300,000 kroner (16,670*l.*) a year towards an improved service of mail and passenger service between Norway and England, with which country a great trade and tourist traffic had sprung up. A proposal to reduce the King's appanage was also made by the Advanced Liberals, but was not carried.

Mr. Stang, the leader of the Conservatives, who hitherto had supported the Government during its many crises, to the surprise of everybody, gave notice that he intended to propose (June 27) a vote of want of confidence in the Government. It will be remembered that the Advanced Liberals had proposed a similar vote early in the session, but it did not suit the purposes of the Conservative party at that time to support the Liberals; but now Mr. Stang found "that it was his duty, before the House adjourned, to ask it to express its opinion on the present Government, which he thought was not in possession of the respect and confidence of the National Assembly and the Norwegian people, without which the successful conduct of the affairs of the country could not be carried on." This notice created, of course, a panic among the Ministry and its supporters, who were now able to see that the friendly support given to them by the Conservatives could only be depended upon till a propitious moment for the latter had arrived to throw over the Sverdrup Ministry and make a struggle for the appointment of a Conservative Government. Desperate attempts were made to induce the Advanced Liberals to rally round the Government, Mr. Sverdrup even promising to eliminate the objectionable members of the Ministry and to replace them by Advanced Liberals. The latter, however, had lost all faith in Mr. Sverdrup, and the negotiations fell through. Mr. Sverdrup and his Ministry, rather than force the vote of want of confidence by the Storting, then decided to retire, and on the day (July 3) on which Mr. Stang's motion was to come on, Mr. Sverdrup tendered his resignation to the King. Mr. Stang in consequence withdrew his motion. Thus the downfall of the Sverdrup Ministry was effected, and all interests became now centred upon the appointment of the new Cabinet. The King, who had arrived in the Norwegian capital (July 5), made no attempt to ascertain if a coalition Ministry of the two Liberal parties could be constructed, but called upon Mr. Stang, the leader of the Conservatives, to form a Cabinet. Mr. Stang

accepted the task, but found it by no means easy. After a few days he was, however, able to present his list to the King, and the new Ministry was appointed (July 12), with Mr. Emil Stang as Prime Minister. Mr. G. W. Gram, a Judge of the High Court of Justice, became Minister of State in attendance upon the King at Stockholm. The other members of the new Government were Mr. Burgomaster E. Rygh, Minister of Finance; Mr. F. N. Roll, a judge of the High Court of Justice, Minister of Justice; Mr. J. A. Bonnevie, a director of Public Schools, Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs; Colonel Hoff, Minister of War; Mr. J. H. P. Thorne, a merchant, Minister of the Interior; Messrs. P. Birch-Reichenwald, U. F. C. Arneberg, and O. A. Furu, all lawyers, were appointed Consultative Councillors of State.

A few political meetings were held in the course of the year, the most important being a meeting at Bergen of delegates from Liberal associations all over the country at which a resolution was passed to the effect "that the old position of the Liberals with regard to the settlement of the transaction of diplomatic affairs was to be upheld."

Towards the end of the year a long and important discussion began in the press on the position of Norway in the Union, Mr. Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, the poet, being one of the principal contributors. He upheld the right of the Norwegians to a full share in the management of diplomatic affairs, and otherwise to "full equality in the Union," which the Swedes have not and are not yet altogether willing to admit and grant to the Norwegians. It will, no doubt, prove most useful that these vexed questions are fully discussed and thrashed out in this way, as the day will soon come when Norway will assert her rights and position in these matters, and serious complications may be avoided when the question is fully understood in both countries.

In May Dr. Frithjof Nansen, of the Christiania University, and his five companions returned home after having successfully crossed the icefields of Greenland on snow-shoes from the eastern to the western coast, this being the first time that the task has been accomplished.

VIII. SWEDEN.

The year in Sweden was marked by few political incidents, and contrasted in this respect with those immediately preceding. The principal aim of the protectionist Government which came into power in the remarkable way explained last year was to carry on the affairs of the country in a practical spirit without troubling themselves or the Riksdag with political questions, and to advance their protectionist programme in all possible ways. The Free Traders, however, confident of a victory at the next elections, limited themselves to making the most out of their opponents' mistakes.

The Riksdag was opened by the King (Jan. 17), who in the Speech from the Throne recalled the attention of the Deputies to his Dictamen of the previous year, according to which the additional revenue received through the increased Customs duties and excise on spirits was to be applied to the amelioration of the working classes. Among the new measures referred to in the speech were a Bill for the protection of workmen's lives and health, and one for the establishment of a Ministry of Agriculture. The finances of the country were declared to be in a satisfactory condition, the Budget showing a revenue of 2,500,000 kroner (about 140,000*l.*) in excess of the expenditure. It was proposed that the greater part of the surplus should be devoted to the construction of railways.

In past years the Landtmanna (peasant) party had been an important factor in the decision of questions of the day, but since Count Posse's withdrawal from it and from political life its influence had seemed to be on the wane; in fact, the party might be said to have ceased to exist. Soon after the assembling of the Riksdag a new Landtmanna party was, however, formed under the leadership of the well-known peasant representative, Lis Olaf Larsson. The policy of this new party has not yet clearly transpired, but it does not appear to be so progressive and liberal in its principles as the old Landtmanna party.

In February a discussion arose in the first Chamber on a motion that the Government should take steps to reduce the expenses in connection with the foreign (diplomatic) service; but while the first Chamber threw out the motion, the second Chamber expressed its approval of the proposal. The Government, moreover, asked for several grants to improve the defences of the country, but the Riksdag, either from a desire to promote economy or for other reasons, seemed to be in no mood for further grants for this object. Thus a demand for 210,000 kroner for two torpedo boats and a Bill for the reorganisation of the cavalry were both rejected.

Since the King, in September 1888, made his remarkable speech at Malmo (see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1888, p. 337) it was generally assumed that an alliance or understanding of some kind had been entered into by the King with the German Emperor. In the beginning of March Mr. Bexel, a member of the second Chamber, gave notice that he would ask the Minister of Foreign Affairs if there was any truth in the rumours that such alliance had been entered into with Germany. As some authentic denial of these rumours was anxiously hoped for, expectation was great when Mr. Bexel (March 7) rose to make his interpellation. He was, however, promptly met by a counter proposal that such an interpellation could not take place, and this was carried by 107 against 72 votes. It was soon rumoured that this vote had been obtained through influence from high quarters in order to avoid unpleasant revelations. Later on in the session, in the course

of a debate, complaint was again made of the secrecy with which the Government always treated foreign questions when these were discussed by the Riksdag.

It will be remembered that after the absurd political situation created by the disqualification of a member, by which the Stockholm election had been upset in the previous year, giving the Protectionists a majority of two in the second Chamber, the great questions at issue in the Riksdag were rather economical than political, and a continuance of the struggle between free trade and protection. Having in the previous session imposed all kinds of additional import duties, it was only natural that the Protectionists should next turn their attention to export duties. A proposal was eventually made that an export duty should be put on iron ore, the chief product of Sweden. This would, no doubt, have been carried had not the Government informed the Riksdag that, owing to the existing commercial treaty with France, they could not impose any such duty during its continuance. The proposal, nevertheless, was pressed by its supporters to a division, but was thrown out in both Chambers. A Bill was also brought in, and ultimately carried, prohibiting the manufacture and importation of margarine butter, in order to protect the important butter industry of Sweden. The King, however, did not at once sanction this measure, and later on in the year (October) he announced in a council his decision not to sanction it, but at the same time subjected the manufacture of margarine to a strict control throughout the country. A grant of 4,000,000 kroner towards the continuation of the Northern Railway was voted by both Chambers.

A Government proposal to amend certain articles of the criminal law with a view of strengthening it against the socialistic propaganda in the country was also carried, but only after the modification of a clause objected to by the Liberals. This amendment became generally known as the "Socialist Law" and was looked upon as an attack upon free speech. No other measure of any importance was passed before the Riksdag adjourned.

The only political question of any interest which occupied public attention during the remainder of the year was the long talked of change or reconstruction of the Government. Baron Bildt, the Prime Minister, who had reluctantly consented to form a Ministry in the previous year, had long been anxious to resign, but the King had a difficulty in finding a successor. In October Count Ehrensward, the Foreign Minister, resigned and was replaced by Count Lewenhaupt, the Swedish and Norwegian Ambassador at Paris, who had greatly irritated the Norwegians by refusing to be present in their department at the opening of the Paris Exhibition (see Norway). This appointment consequently did not meet with much favour in the latter country, and some of the Swedish papers also protested against it owing to the little sympathy the Norwegians had for Count Lewenhaupt.

In the meantime the King had found a successor to Baron Bildt, and the Prime Minister was allowed to resign. Count Åkerhjelm became the head of the New Ministry, which was reconstructed as follows: Count Lewenhaupt, Foreign Minister; Von Krusenstjerna, Minister of Post (Postmaster General); Mr. Groll, Minister of the Interior; and Mr. Wikblad was appointed Consultative Councillor. The other members of the Ministry retained their portfolios. This reconstruction of the Ministry was not of a political character, but was rather made in view of administrative purposes.

CHAPTER V.

ASIA.

INDIA, AFGHANISTAN, CENTRAL ASIA, CHINA, AND JAPAN.

Afghanistan.—The authority of Abdur Rahman this year reached a higher stage of stability all over Afghanistan than had been known since his decisive defeat of Ayub Khan at Khandahar after our withdrawal from the country. The Amir had, in the beginning of the year, been absent for some six months from Kabul, yet not a sign of rebellion appeared among the turbulent tribesmen in the neighbourhood. The operations against the rebellious Shinwaris of the Safed Koh about Jellalabad were commenced by Gulam Hydar Khan, the Amir's general, who attacked the Shinwaris and occupied some of their villages.

The rebellion which Ishak raised was not one in which the people of the northern provinces took any part. After the battle at Ghaznigak, in which Ishak was defeated, the regulars had no option but to surrender, while the militia were eager to make peace. The Amir had but little to fear from the tribesmen north of the Hindu Khush, as they were but poorly armed and far from warlike, but he was obliged to take the severest measures in stamping out mutiny amongst the old garrison formerly under Ishak's command, for the whole of his power rests on his army.

The Amir also established a small arms factory at Kabul, where every part of a rifle, including the barrel, could be manufactured, and ammunition made.

He would not have dared to have left Kabul to cross the Hindu Khush if his grip of the country had not been strong, as Ishak's rebellion had miscarried, his army had been dispersed, and his secret adherents were too alarmed to make any sign. Ishak himself had fled over the Oxus, and was but coldly received by the Russian authorities. Ayub had been in durance at Rawal Pindi for some time past, and the fact of his confinement within our borders must always show to Abdur Rahman the folly of breaking his alliance with India. In the commencement of the year a man of the 4th Herati Regiment fired at the Amir at

Mazar-i-Sherif, but missed him. He was at once cut down by the Amir's officers.

Both the Amir of Kabul and the Russian Government alike disclaimed all warlike intentions in Central Asia. The Amir remained quietly in his camp at Mazar-i-Sherif, and, though the Russian Government strengthened its outposts on the frontier, no collision resulted. There are, however, inflammable materials in that part of Asia, and the danger of their being fired by an irresponsible hand is great, whether Russian or Afghan, and this danger was increased by the presence of the Amir on the frontier.

In the middle of the year a rebellion against the Amir was reported to have broken out in Badakshan. Some of the Mirs of the provinces who had been expelled a few years before returned and were joined by a number of the inhabitants. When Abdur Rahman appointed an Afghan governor, Abdalla Jan, to rule over them, many of the Mirs fled, the majority of the refugees going across the Oxus into Bokharan territory. Their animosity was naturally excited against the Amir, but they were unable to resist his authority until, seizing the present opportunity, they made an effort to reinstate themselves. The rebellion was crushed with little difficulty.

Persia.—The Russians laboured throughout the year to counteract the effect of the Karun River arrangement, which promised to British trade certain facilities. This touched their pride and their diplomatic *prestige* in Persia. By the pressure they brought on the Shah they compelled him to receive a Russian Consul at Meshad, and the new concessions demanded of Persia consist of, in addition to political conditions, stipulations giving increased facilities to Russian imports. The Russians probably wish to extend their dominion towards Meshad. They are anxious to get a footing in Khorassan and push their outposts westward from Sarakhs.

Burma.—The Shan States, which stretch from Yunan to Siam, have a population of two millions, split up into various clans, each owning its chief, and only too often at enmity with its neighbours. Their alliance with the kings of Burma was more nominal than real. When not engaged in resisting the attacks of the Burmans they were busy in fighting for their own chiefs, whose tenure of power was of the slightest. Nevertheless they have found time to trade between China and Burma, being ready travellers and shrewd dealers. When Thebaw's kingdom fell to pieces in 1885-86 they proceeded to raid into British Burma. The chiefs, however, near the border, were won over to acknowledge the suzerain power, and gradually our influence extended eastwards. The surrender of the Limbin Prince was followed by the submission of all the southern Shan States, and the marching of our columns through the country has established our power on a firm basis. The greatest difficulties had to be overcome, not so much

from the hostility of the people as from the struggles between the various pretenders in the states. The method in vogue generally was to invite the nearest Shan chiefs to meet our officers, to give them assurances of protection and friendship, and generally to prevent them throwing in their lot with the dacoits. As Upper Burma settled down the political officers were able to extend their influence over a wider extent of country. They dispersed marauders, settled disputes of succession among the tribal chiefs, and established permanent outposts on the borders. The refugees are now returning to their villages, and, with the establishment of peace and the opening out of railways in the distant future, a great era of prosperity is anticipated.

Dacoity in Burma is being steadily stamped out, owing to the energy shown by the military police in the pursuit of such gangs as ventured to leave their jungle retreats. The number of guns amongst the dacoits has continually decreased, but there was, however, a considerable amount of crime still to be coped with, cattle-lifting and raiding upon unprotected villages constantly recurring. The outlook in Upper and Lower Burma in the beginning of the year was brighter than it had been for some time past, and there had been a splendid harvest. In Lower Burma the Arakan and Tenasserim districts were quiet. The chief of Wuntho was still suspicious, but he did not fail to assist the new railway survey party with provisions and carriage. The Karenni expedition, too, proved a marked success. With a column of 580 men and two guns the officer in command pushed rapidly into the Karen hills and broke the chief Sawlapaw's power in a few days. On the capture of his headquarters at Sawlon the chief fled, a successor was speedily found, and such guarantees were taken as would give the best security attainable under the circumstances for the future good government of the Eastern Karenni hill tracts. With a country of such vast extent as Upper Burma the protection of the frontier must always be a matter of the first importance, and it may be necessary for a year or two to send expeditions against the outlying tribes. The Siglo pretender was captured in the Shan hills. He had been the moving spirit in the disturbances in the country south of Mandalay; and in the Kyonkse district the capture of Boh Nga Kwah, one of the dacoit leaders who had been the chief disturbers of peace in the Pokoko district, was effected. In the beginning of the year some twenty-four villages in the Mong Raja's estate in British territory were raided and all the inhabitants killed or carried off by the men of the Siglo tribe in the Lushai country. After this raids were made on the Chittagong hill tracts and the Cachar borders, which are under British protection. The massing of troops at Drinagin preserved order, but further north there was no obstacle to raiding. The first expedition into the Lushai country resulted in the punishment of at least one section of the Shendas by the burning of the villages

of their chiefs Housata and Sahouta, the making of a good mule road from Drinagin fifty miles inland, and the fortification of a fortified post at Lungleh, which was practically completed. All this has been done by a small body of native troops and police. The Shendas who had been most concerned in the last year's raids held aloof from the first, trusting to the natural difficulties of their hills to delay any advance. The Lushai country, from Cachar to Arakan, cannot be left in a state of barbarism, and our influence must be made supreme across the narrow strip of country between the Chittagong and Cachar hills and the frontier of Upper Burma by an uninterrupted line of posts. It was decided, therefore, in the cold weather of 1889-90 to send an expedition through the Chin-Lushai country to Burma. No grace was to be extended to the leaders in the past raids until they had made such reparation as lay in their power; they will have to surrender their captives and bring in the heads and weapons which they have taken in their excursions into British territory, and to tender their submission before the question of treatment can be settled. All the Honlong chiefs and several Shenda leaders attended the Durbar held by the officer in command at Drinagin, and must have learnt the intentions of Government. With such enemies it was thought necessary to be stern and unyielding at the outset, relaxing afterwards when cowed and made to realise that there was not a part of their jungles which our armed force could not visit and penetrate. In the expedition into the Karenni country the Siamese Government assisted the British by blocking the retreat of the Karenni chief to the east; it being found necessary to clearly define the border of the Shan states in the direction of Siam. English capital being required to develop the country by railways, it was important that there should be no disturbing outside influence. The Tounghoo-Mandalay Railway was opened on Feb. 27, connecting Upper and Lower Burma; promising the expansion of trade and the bestowal of peace on a fine country and nation, and forming the basis of future railways to the Shan States. The revenue of Upper Burma was twenty lakhs in the first year of our occupation; in the second it was thirty, and this year it was expected to amount to sixty-seven lakhs. The Burma ruby mines having been leased to a syndicate of Messrs. Streeter, Rothschild, & Co., the lessees undertook to pay an annual rent of four lakhs for twenty years and one-sixth of the net profits. The dissolution of the Hlutdaw, or Burmese Council of Ministers, which took place this year, was the natural consequence of the consolidation of our power in Upper Burma. In May 1886 five of the Ministers were confirmed in their position, and became a sort of consultative council to the Chief Commissioner. They had little or no administrative power, though they were employed in difficult dealings with dacoit leaders or contumacious chiefs, which had to be carried on. As the work of pacification proceeded and the

country gradually became settled under our administrative officers, the *raison d'être* of the Hlutdaw passed away. The Chief Commissioner undertook to frame a well-organised programme for the gradual survey and settlement of Upper Burma.

A railway projected from Sagain up the Mu valley to Mogoung, with a branch in the direction of Bhamo, proposes to effect for the northern part of Upper Burma what the Tounghoo-Mandalay extension has done for the eastern districts in opening up the country, facilitating military operations, and tending to bring about complete pacification.

Thibet and Sikkim.—It was hoped in the beginning of the year that the outcome of the negotiations at Gnatong would result in an acknowledgment by the Ampa, on the part of Thibet, of the exclusive suzerainty of the British over Sikkim, and an undertaking for the non-interference of the Lhasa Lamas in the affairs of the state. Opportunity was to have been taken to arrive at an understanding on the question of trade facilities.

The trade with Thibet has never been of great importance, and the uncertainties of the last three years have almost extinguished it. Three years ago the value of exports and imports amounted to about 6½ lakhs, but now scarcely reached 3½ lakhs. The war party at Lhasa clung to the idea of making Sikkim a dependency of Thibet, in complete ignorance of the conditions under which Sikkim became a feudatory of India in the past. They endeavoured to show that Pekin was as much interested in extending its influence over Sikkim as the Lamas. The Lhasa authorities, however, refused to send any trustworthy representative to Gnatong to meet the British officer, and matters for some time were at a standstill. Although the Indian Government went as far as possible in the direction of conciliation, the negotiations at Gnatong failed to secure a settlement, and the Ampa, or Amban, returned to Lhasa. His reasons for not accepting terms were no doubt due to the knowledge that he could not control the Lamas. The Government of India decided that Sikkim was and must remain a feudatory state of India.

Subsequently Mr. Hart was sent by the Chinese Government to Thibet to procure a satisfactory settlement of the question. This spontaneous action would seem to show that the Pekin Government had no sympathy with the pretensions of the Lhasa Lamas. The Thibetans, however, still remained obstinate and refused to come to terms. Although their influence in Sikkim had broken down, and their army been driven back, they still hoped that China would interfere, and that the Government of India would be so embarrassed as to leave off their attempt to solve the Thibet-Sikkim question.

After the Raja of Sikkim had been freed from Thibetan influence, and British troops placed so as to repel any invasion of his country, the Government of India determined not to allow

any Thibetan or Chinese influence in Sikkim, and resolved to promptly resent any show of force. If the Chinese authorities could have prevailed in preventing the Lamas from making a military display the question would soon have been settled, as the people of Sikkim were content to remain under British protection.

After Mr. Hart's mission had failed, it was intended that the troops should act more on the offensive; subsequently, however, it was seen that the question would solve itself by the lapse of time. The Indian Government throughout firmly refused to recognise the existence of the shadowy rights of Chinese suzerainty over Sikkim which was claimed by the Amban. The Amban himself failed to prove them, and the Lhasa Lamas held sullenly aloof. At no time did the Thibetans show any inclination to renew warlike operations; our troops remained quietly in the clouds at Gnatong, their presence proving that further interference with Sikkim would not be tolerated. The position is not a satisfactory one, for although since March 1888 Sikkim has been released completely from Thibetan influence, and the aggressive policy of the Lhasa Lamas been summarily checked, yet Thibet has not ceased to advance its claim to paramount influence in Sikkim. If the Chinese Government would acknowledge that Sikkim was outside the pale of its influence a settlement might be speedily effected. In August the Government of India decided to remove a portion of the Sikkim field force from Gnatong. At the end of the year the matter had remained *in statu quo*, but it was not likely that the Thibetans would again try conclusions with our troops. It was, however, thought advisable to maintain a small garrison in Sikkim to prevent any fresh attempt by Thibet to coerce the Raja.

Native States.—The troops of the Dholepur durbar broke up a band of dacoits which had long infested the Agra-Gwalior frontier; and the three chief leaders were killed. The Travancore Government decided to introduce the rupee currency into their state, and silver and gold chakranis and fananis will gradually be disused. The Nizam moreover showed an inclination to take a larger share in the administration of his state; a step chiefly due to the presence of an intermediary between himself and the Minister and to the Resident's influence.

On Jan. 23 of this year (1889) their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught arrived at Hyderabad on a visit to the Nizam. They stayed at the Minister's palace at Chaddaghat, and received a most sumptuous and loyal welcome, with which H.R.H. the Duke expressed himself greatly pleased.

Satisfactory progress has been made in reorganising the troops of the native chiefs in the Punjaub. The chiefs of Bhurt-pore and Jodhpore have undertaken to select infantry and

cavalry for special training from their existing regiments for the defence of the north-west frontier. Ulwa has engaged to provide 600 cavalry and 1,000 infantry. In Jeypore the Maharaja has offered to provide 1,000 ponies fully equipped for transport service. In Bikanir an armed camel corps, 500 strong, is being raised and equipped. Drill instructors have been chosen from our native army and a number of officers and non-commissioned officers of the native chiefs have been sent to various cavalry and infantry regiments in the Punjab to be instructed in their duties under British officers. The Secretary of State also approved of the proposal of the Government of India to utilise a portion of the Kashmir troops, when reorganised, in garrisoning Gilgit.

Kashmir.—In April of this year a number of letters fell into the possession of the Resident of Kashmir revealing a long course of treasonable practices on the part of the Maharaja. These letters had formerly been in the possession of Laxman Dass, the late Dewan, or Minister, who hoped by means of them to put pressure on the Maharaja which would insure his own reinstatement. As Laxman Dass was not brought back, they found their way into the Resident's hands. Among other things they are said to have revealed a plot to poison the late Resident, Mr. Plowden. The Resident, Colonel Nisbet, challenged the Maharaja, who did not deny the charges laid against him, but proposed a plan by which he should abdicate the throne, and that a council with an English officer attached should retain the administrative power in its hands. There was every reason for believing the letters to be genuine, but regarding the act as that of a foolish rather than of a designing person, the Government of India attached but little political significance to them, knowing that the Maharaja had been ill-advised enough to trust his interests to men who had their own selfish objects to serve. The Government accepted the Maharaja's resignation and based its action on considerations of the general maladministration of Kashmir for a long time past, on the notorious incapacity of the Maharaja to direct the affairs of the state, and on the expressed desire of his Highness to divest himself of all power for a season. They nominated a Mahomedan official to the council instead of the English official asked for by the Maharaja, and directed that the council should consult the Resident in all important affairs of state. Subsequently it was found that the council of the Kashmir State were performing their duties quietly and regularly. They arranged for giving the state troops their arrears of pay and for regularity of payment in the future. There is no doubt that the misgovernment of the Maharaja of Kashmir had reached such a point beyond which it could not go without involving the paramount Power in the charge of having neglected its duty towards the miserable subjects entrusted to his Highness' rule. For some time before the abdication public

money had been recklessly squandered; justice could be had only upon payment; the revenues collected did not find their way into the state treasury; high and important offices were bestowed on unworthy favourites. Interference was thus forced on the supreme Government. The council, composed of the best officers the native civil service could give, had at their head the Maharaja's own brother; the Resident's duty being to guide the council and supervise the various branches of the administration.

Railways.—The Bengal Chamber of Commerce contended in a memorial which they addressed to Lord Lansdowne that the question of Government guarantee should not be one of mere profit and loss, and that in a country like India it was the primary duty of Government to secure that provinces and districts should be severed from the dangers of isolation, and that no large masses of the people should be shut out from help in times of famine. The public accepted the necessity of strategical railways, but Government, by refusing a guarantee, shut out Indian railway enterprises from drawing upon those vast resources of capital which by the terms of English trusts are forbidden to be invested in undertakings not certified by a Government guarantee. The same chamber of commerce also urged on the Government of India—

- (a) A wise relaxation of the system of state guarantee.
- (b) The early completion of the trans-Ganges system of railways.
- (c) The speedy extension of the Oude-Rohilkund line to Calcutta.
- (d) The furtherance of the construction of the Bengal end of the Bengal-Nagpure line.
- (e) The construction of a line from Tarkessur to a point on the Bengal-Nagpure Railway which shall afford the cheapest outlet to the trade of the eastern portion of the central provinces.
- (f) The construction of subsidiary lines to the trunk line of the Bengal-Nagpure Railway.
- (g) The immediate opening up of the large coal and mineral deposits of the Raneehi and Palanow districts.
- (h) The extension of the Bengal Central Railway to Madaripore.

During the past twelve months 886 miles of new line were opened, thus bringing up the total mileage to 15,245 miles. The construction was chiefly on the Indian Midland, Tounghoo and Mandalay extension, and the Bengal-Nagpure lines. Over 2,000 miles of railway have since been sanctioned, and we may expect in another five years to have at least 20,000 miles of railway open in Burma and India. The gross receipts were 1,976 lakhs of rupees, of which nearly one-half were consumed in working expenses; the net revenue representing $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the capital expended on open lines.

It is proposed to convert the Wadwan-Vizangaum section of the Wadwan-Sabarma line into a metre gauge, and construct a loop line from Vizangaum to the Mehsana junction on the Rajputana Railway. The Bhownuggur State will find fifteen lakhs for the Wadwan-Vizangaum section, and the Gaikwar will provide for the loop line. The Shansi-Gwalior section of the Indian Midland Railway was opened in March. The work on the Delhi-Kalka Railway was pushed on vigorously, and a good portion was ready by the end of the year. More communication is still needed in Central and Northern India. In urging for a line independent of the East Indian Railway, and involving a shorter route to the upper provinces, we must remember that the line of the Ganges determines the line of the traffic of Northern India and of any railway meant to serve that traffic. Hence the extension of the Oude-Rohilcund Railway to Calcutta has been recommended, although Government decided to allow no railway to compete with an existing line:

Season.—The first reports furnished to the Government of India regarding the distress in Gangam, a district of the Madras Presidency, were sent in about the middle of December 1888. The rains in 1888 had been insufficient to enable the villagers to cultivate all their land, and a poor harvest was the result. Subsequently the scarcity assumed graver proportions than was anticipated. Active measures were taken by the local authorities to provide work for the poor, who left their homes and flocked to all the large centres in search of food. The distressed area was about 125 square miles in extent, and contained a population of about 62,000. As the new year advanced nearly 21,000 labourers resorted to the relief works, which consisted in making the excavation of a large reservoir at Rushikalyn, calculated to cost thirty-one lakhs of rupees, and the Gopalpore Canal, costing three and a half lakhs. Cholera, however, made its appearance in a virulent form, and scared the coolies away from the works, upwards of 14,000 people being estimated to have died from March to July from this epidemic. The Governor of Madras himself visited the distressed districts: and found that some 3,000 people were in a state of actual starvation. The European staff of the district was strengthened, and gratuitous relief largely afforded by the distribution of cooked food and the import of seed-grains, while the medical staff was increased to check the cholera epidemic. The mortality, except from cholera, was not great, and although when appearing in an epidemic form it is impossible to check its ravages, its results are not nearly so terrible as those of famine fever, which, owing to the conditions of life in Gangam, is a danger of constant recurrence. The normal rate of wages is low, as food-grains are cheaper in the Gangam than in any other district, so that any marked rise in prices makes itself acutely felt. This part of the country too is isolated, and the best preventive of another famine in the future will be to main-

tain an easy means of communication with the district by means of a new railway ; and this the Government of India proposed to commence.

Army.—Two expensive schemes of defence have been pushed forward to completion, involving an outlay of very nearly nineteen crores of rupees. One is the building of the Frontier Railway, at a cost of about thirteen and a half crores, and the other the making of frontier and coast defences, calculated to cost about five and a half crores. In connection with the former over ten crores, and with the latter three crores, have been already spent.

The defences of Quetta are practically finished, and they are sufficient to make the south-west bastion of India secure against attack. The Karachi defences are nearly completed, though some time will elapse before the heavy guns can be put in position. At Bombay two-thirds of the defence works have been built. A new fort has been constructed at Rangoon, and the defences of Calcutta taken in hand. The submarine defences of Karachi, Bombay, Calcutta, and Rangoon have been laid down, and torpedo boats brought from England for each of these ports. Some twenty lakhs of rupees are to be spent for additional transport animals, laying in supplies of food and fodder at certain points on the north-west frontier, and providing reserves of clothing, equipment, transport, and ambulance necessities, it being considered better policy to incur heavy expenditure than to risk a scare which might involve a loss of millions in sudden outlay. A committee was appointed to inquire into the question of military transport over railways in India. A camp of exercise was held at Lucknow with the usual manœuvres and sham fights.

Congress.—In the month of December Mr. Bradlaugh, the member for Northampton, visited India and attended the annual meeting of the Indian National Congress, which was held this year in Bombay, promising on his return to England to submit a Bill to the House of Commons, framed with the object of enlarging the popular basis of the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils. The chief points of importance discussed were that non-official and elected members of the councils should never be in a minority, and that every act of the executive government, except matters of foreign policy, military disposition or strategy, imperilling the public interests, should be brought before, discussed and determined by the councils. It was also resolved that the Viceroy's Legislative Council should be taken from the members of the Provincial Councils, thus concentrating interest on the elections to the latter bodies. The electors to these councils are to comprise members of municipal and local boards, of chambers of commerce, of trades and planters' associations, and of university graduates.

Exchange.—With regard to exchange the Bimetallic League have shown that—

(a) That as long as bimetalism was in force up to 1873 it kept the market price of silver steadily at about fifteen and a half to one.

(b) That if reintroduced it would have the same effect as before.

(c) That the evils of a fluctuating exchange between gold- and silver-using countries are great and cannot be disregarded.

(d) There is no danger of gold disappearing if bimetalism be introduced.

(e) That the adoption of a common monetary standard by all the great nations of the world is desirable.

(f) That gold and silver must be continued to be used as money, and the result of using them independently and separately has been most unsatisfactory and may become disastrous.

Post Office Savings Banks.—On March 31, 1888, there were 6,152 Government savings banks in India, and they contained 332,175 accounts, which received from Government Rs. 22,38,609 in the shape of interest, and possessed balances aggregating Rs. 6,67,63,315. The number of depositors has risen from 71,264 in 1887-88 to 332,176 in 1888-89.

Excise.—In the Madras and Bombay Presidencies the revenue administration has been most successful, as these two provinces with thirty-one and sixteen and a half millions of inhabitants produce a revenue nearly as large as that of Bengal with sixty-nine millions. In both these provinces the whole system of distillation has been brought more thoroughly under control, and stricter and more methodical preventive measures have enabled the Government to greatly enhance the rate of duty, for the question of the rate of duty which it is possible to levy is simply the question of the prevention of illicit distillation. By the prevention of illicit distillation it will be possible to raise a large revenue, the increase of revenue being accompanied not by an increase of, but by a check on, drinking. In Northern India and throughout the wild forest districts of India there is no doubt that there is very extensive smuggling and illicit distillation of liquor. That the above policy has already proved to be a marked success in the Madras Presidency, both in respect of checking the consumption and increasing the revenue, is shown by the following figures :—

| | Consumption in gallons. | Revenue. Rx. ¹ |
|---------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1883-84 | 1,204,241 | 280,977 |
| | Year of transition. | |
| 1884-85 | 1,014,566 | 347,526 |
| 1887-88 | 1,270,146 | 415,319 |

It is not an unfair conclusion, therefore, to draw that an increase in revenue from excise does not necessarily justify the

• ¹ Rx represents tens of rupees.

inference that there has been an increase in the consumption of liquor, but rather has it been conclusively shown that an increased revenue has been received upon a diminished consumption.

Budget.—The magnitude of the financial transactions of the Government of India is now very great, the aggregate of revenue and expenditure as entered in the estimates for 1889–90 being more than Rx. 166,000,000. The revenue and expenditure as recorded in the accounts include the gross receipts and working expenses of Indian State Railways and the net receipts of the old guaranteed railways, and it is this inclusion which swells the total revenue and expenditure, and causes them to increase so rapidly.

In the financial statement of March 1888 the revenue of the year 1887–88, which was then about to close was estimated at Rx. 77,926,600, and the expenditure chargeable thereon at Rx. 80,948,800, the deficit being Rx. 3,016,700. The cost of the special defence works which were being constructed for the protection of the north-west frontier and the chief places on the coast was included in the expenditure. On closing, however, the accounts of the year 1887–88 the actual figures proved to be:—revenue Rx. 78,759,744, expenditure Rx. 80,788,576, and the deficit of 1887–88 is finally shown to be Rx. 2,028,832, being an improvement of Rx. 87,818 on the estimated deficit. The difference was due mainly to an improvement in the home account of Rx. 120,900 and to the inclusion as revenue of a special item of Rx. 300,000 representing the gain by exchange on the capital transactions of subsidised railways in England.

The revenue in India (imperial, provincial, and local) proved to be Rx. 829,003 more, and the expenditure in India under the same heads Rx. 379,713 less than the estimate of March 1888. The increase resulted to the amount of Rx. 244,540 from the gain by exchange on capital transactions of subsidised railways in England, while the balance represents the actual improvement in revenue. The reduction in expenditure was mainly due to a less expenditure under special defence works, opium, interest on ordinary debt, and military works. The estimate of 1887–88 as originally framed in March 1887 showed a surplus of Rx. 16,700, representing practically a bare equilibrium of revenue and expenditure. This trifling surplus has proved on closing the accounts of the year to have become a deficit of Rx. 2,028,832. This deficit was due to the conversion of the Indian 4 per cent. stock of 48,200,000*l.* into 3½ per cent., throwing on the accounts of that year a charge of 1*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*, which would have been otherwise paid in 1888–89, and to a decision to charge against revenue expenditure on special defence works which had been treated in the estimates as a charge against borrowed money. As other causes for apprehension were found in the fall in exchange, the

reduction in the net railway revenue, the fall in the price of opium, and the increased military expenditure in Burma, steps were taken towards the close of the year to add to the revenue by the imposition of fresh taxation as follows :—

(a) The raising of the rate of the duty on salt from Rs. 2 to Rs. 2-8 a maund, with effect from January 19, 1888, except in Burma, where the rate was raised from three annas to one rupee a maund.

(b) The imposition of a duty on the import of petroleum with effect from the same date, and

(c) The extension of the Income Tax Act to Lower Burma from 1888-89.

The full effect of the above measures has only been felt in 1888-89, but still the estimates of that year showed a deficit of Rx. 698,000 after including expenditure on special defence works. The financial position has again been injuriously affected by a considerable fall in exchange. In the estimates the rupee was taken at 1-4-9; the rate actually received has been 1-4-38, a fall of more than a halfpenny per rupee. The head under which the greatest increase of revenue is anticipated is exchange. The receipts under exchange arise from the net gain accruing to Government in consequence of certain remittance transactions by it under contract or as concessions at a rate of exchange different from the average rate obtained by the Secretary of State by the sale of bills and telegraphic transfers. The gross earnings of state railways are almost the same as in the original estimate, but there is a serious falling off of Rx. 250,000 in the East Indian Railway, ascribed to the cessation of an abnormal traffic in the previous year caused by a scarcity in the North-West Provinces, a continued decrease in a long lead traffic of wheat and grain from Upper India, and a diversion of traffic consequent on the opening of the Indian Midland Railway. The increase of Rx. 107,000 in receipts from opium is entirely due to the rise in the price of the Bengal drug. The average price of Bengal opium has been Rs. 1,120, as against an estimate of Rs. 1,042 per chest. The rise in the price of the Bengal drug and the reduced exports from Malwa appear to have been due to short crops in China and Malwa.

The year 1887-88 was the second in which the income-tax of 1886 was in operation, and the smoother working of the administrative machinery is indicated by the reduction in 1887-88 in the number of objections from 100,428 to 72,571 in the amount refunded from Rx. 27,067 to Rx. 19,947, and in the cost of collection from Rx. 30,157 to Rx. 28,679. The net collections exceeded those of the previous year by Rx. 105,297, and amounted to Rx. 1,382,808. The increase of expenditure under the head "Army" is due to the Sikkim, Black Mountain, and Lushai expeditions, to the rupee payments to British troops having been increased by the fall in the rate of exchange, and to

the higher expenditure on account of the dearness of provisions and forage.

The revenue of the coming year 1889-90 is estimated at Rx. 82,935,300 and the total expenditure at Rx. 83,469,800. The Secretary of State, in sanctioning the additional taxation above-mentioned, pointed out the inequality of the existing arrangements, which secure freedom from financial difficulties to the local governments while the supreme government is passing through a stage of acute embarrassment. It was, therefore, decided that the Central Provinces, Burma, Assam, Bengal, North-Western Provinces, Madras, and Bombay Local Governments should make a joint contribution of Rx. 740,000. Provincial resources are so ample that the contribution has been made without seriously affecting the financial positions of any of the local governments. The falling off of the receipts from the East Indian Railway has been more than covered by the increase on the Great Indian Peninsula line. The estimated gross receipts of this line show an anticipated increase of Rx. 400,000 over the budget of the year about to close. The estimate is based on the traffic of the past twelve months, which has shown a steady improvement, likely not only to be maintained, but to be still further augmented by the opening of the Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpure Railways. The opening of the Indian Midland may, on the other hand, tend to reduce the earnings of the Rajputana-Malwa and Bombay-Baroda lines.

The rapidity with which the construction of railways has been pushed on and the influence of the fall in exchange have had an injurious influence on the net results of the railway revenue account. This loss has increased from Rx. 1,044,203 in 1880-81 to Rx. 2,026,600 in the estimate of 1889-90.

On March 31, 1880, there were 8,382 miles of railway open. At present, on March 31, 1889, there are 13,671 miles of railway open and 1,438 miles under construction. The average yearly expenditure of capital on railways since 1879-80 has been Rx. 7,197,000.

The land revenue is estimated to increase by Rx. 340,800. The petroleum tax, when it was first imposed, was expected to give a revenue of Rx. 100,000 on a total import of 32,000,000 gallons. It is expected to give in the current year a revenue of Rx. 115,000 on an import of 38,000,000 gallons, and for 1889-90 it is expected to give Rx. 120,000. The estimated decrease of Rx. 193,000 under opium is due to a decrease under Malwa opium, owing to an expected reduction in the number of chests exported from 35,350 to 30,000. In salt a large increase over the revenue of the current year is expected, as the falling off this year is mainly due to unfounded rumours of an immediate reduction of the duty.

The estimated increase in expenditure is due mainly to the increase in the home expenditure, owing to provision made for

the purchase of magazine rifles and 12-pounder breechloading guns. It is impossible to avoid such expenditure without placing the Indian Army in a position of inferiority as compared with that of other countries. The cost of these rifles and guns accounts for 206,000*l.* (true sterling) of the home expenditure.

A sum of Rx. 203,500 on account of mobilisation is intended to meet the cost of purchasing transport animals, provisions, and equipments, so that in case of need an army corps may be in a position to take the field promptly. This is one of those precautions which in the present days of scientific warfare cannot safely be neglected. The increase of expenditure on police is Rx. 168,800, and of this Rx. 125,600 is on account of police in Upper Burma.

The expenditure on opium cultivation and manufacture is determined by the amount of crude opium produced. The area under cultivation in the present season is 14 per cent. less than last year, and the produce is estimated at 15 per cent. less. Our reserve of opium is unusually large, and is expected to stand at 49,705 chests at the end of 1889. With a reserve of this magnitude it is obviously desirable to temporarily reduce production, and this policy has been adopted in making engagements for the present season.

The Mandalay Railway extension, for which a large grant was made in 1888-89, is now practically completed, while for the Sind-Pishin, Sind-Sagar, and Assam-Bihar lines, which are approaching completion, a comparatively small sum is required.

A provision of Rx. 1,021,600 has been made for the Villipuram-Dharmavaram line, which is to be constructed by the South Indian Railway. Other new railway works are an extension of the Eastern Bengal Railway to Badga-Badga, and the construction of the Barrakar and Peshwar-Jamrood branch lines.

The special difficulties with which Indian finance has to contend are war, famine, the fall in exchange, and the reduction of the revenue from opium. Petty frontier wars are almost certain to occur at intervals, but their cost is not such as to seriously embarrass the finances. Expenditure must, however, be incurred as an assurance against national danger to meet the expenses of any war on a large scale which may occur in the immediate future. The country has escaped famine for a decade, but there is no ground for assuming that the climatic conditions of the Indian continent have changed and that there will never be a drought sufficient to produce a famine.

Regarding the future of exchange it is not possible to give a confident opinion. Before the year 1873 gold and silver were never used as legal standards without the regulating influence of a system of double legal tender, and there is consequently no experience in the past to which we can appeal in proving an

opinion as to the probable course of events in the future. During the last fifteen years the great falls in the value of the rupee have coincided with corresponding falls in the gold prices of commodities. If this law should hold good in the future the gold value of the rupee will not again fall largely and suddenly unless the gold prices of commodities fall.

The question of the future relations between the gold and silver standards is one of great importance for India. The present condition is one of continued fall and rise. Either there will be a continuous progress in the direction of demonetising silver and substituting gold or the world will revert to the double system of legal tender. In the former case the value of the rupee will fall—it is impossible to foretell how low. The question of restoring the old ratio of one to fifteen and a half between gold and silver is one to be settled by international agreement. The future of opium is surrounded with as much difficulty as that of exchange. There has been in the current year a considerable rise in the price of the Bengal drug, but that rise has been due to a large extent to poor crops in Malwa and China, and has been accompanied by a large falling off in the exports of Malwa opium. Already the price of Bengal opium has fallen from its highest figure of Rs. 1,244 a chest in November to Rs. 1,126 a chest at the sales of the present month.

The improvement of means of communication by the opening out of railways is exercising a marked beneficial influence on the country. The progress of the cotton-spinning industries is the best example of the change that is taking place. In 1880–81 there were 18,307 looms and 1,470,830 spindles at work, employing 39,537 persons. In 1887–88 there are no less than 18,840 and 2,375,739 spindles and 88,815 people at work. The exports of Indian yarn and cotton cloth were valued at Rx. 1,909,134 in 1880–81. In 1887–88 they amounted to Rx. 5,227,928, and the returns of the current year show further progress. There was a considerable fall in the salt revenue of 1887–88 as compared with that of 1886–87. In the former year the production was 31,186,000 maunds as contrasted with an outturn of 32,200,000 of the latter period. The quantity of salt paying duty in any year is not a perfect test of the quantity of salt actually consumed in the year by the people. There is always a large amount of salt in the hands of dealers, and a falling off in any one year may represent a reduction of the quantity of salt in the hands of merchants, but not of the salt actually consumed. The variations are due almost entirely to trade fluctuations. The raising of the rate of duty in January 1888 was followed by reduced issues, and rumours regarding an impending reduction of the duty have had an unfavourable effect on the trade during 1888–89. In Northern India constant rumours have prevailed of an imminent change, and it was believed that the rise in the rate of exchange

which took place in January 1889 would so improve the position of the Government of India as to lead to the reduction of the duty. These rumours have had the effect of checking issues and causing traders to keep their stocks at a minimum. No trader was willing to pay a duty of R. 2-8 a maund on salt so long as it was expected that the duty would be shortly reduced. The rumours of the intention to reduce the duty have been contradicted through the agency of the press. The estimate of the salt revenue has now had to be taken at a reduction of sixteen lakhs of rupees on the forecast made at the end of February 1888. No doubt this amount will be to a large extent recovered, but too late to materially affect the revenue of 1888-89. Salt is locally manufactured on the sea coast in Burma, and there is a certain amount produced from brine wells in Upper Burma. The local manufacture is insufficiently supervised, and an experienced officer of the Northern India Salt Department has just been deputed to Burma by the Government of India to inquire into the whole question on the spot.

The charge that Government does not do all it might to assist trade sometimes takes the form of an assertion that the currency balances should be lent out in a time of pressure. The justification, however, for the existence of the reserve treasuries is to be found in the special conditions affecting the Indian money market. These special conditions are the liability of the market to extreme pressure at times, the difficulty in adding temporarily to the amount of cash by drawing on other markets, and the magnitude of the cash transactions of Government as compared with those of trade. Under these circumstances, and looking to the fact that the Government in the case of war, famine, or other unexpected cause, is exposed to the risk of having to meet sudden and large demands on it for cash, it was decided by Lord Northbrook's Government that it would be to the interest both of the commercial public and of the Government of India that the surplus cash for the time being of the Government of India in excess of certain regulated balances in the Presidency banks and the cash in Mofussil treasuries should be kept in reserve treasuries. It was held that if the whole of the surplus cash were kept in the Presidency banks trade would rely on the permanence of the resources thus supplied to it, and that, in the case of a sudden demand for cash, the Government of India would be either forced to abandon its right to reduce its balance in the Presidency banks or risk producing a financial crisis by suddenly and largely reducing the resources at these banks.

On June 29, 1889, a notification appeared in the *Gazette of India* that the Governor-General in council had resolved to borrow 200 lakhs of rupees for the public service on all the conditions which apply to the 4 per cent. loan of 1854-55.

In the various criticisms passed on the budget when discussed in the Legislative Council it was suggested that it was

clearly not for the advantage of the Empire as a whole that there should exist within its limits two monetary standards varying largely and rapidly in relative value, and that, in the present days of keen competition of telegraphs and of steam communication, any cause which hampers trade and impedes the free flow of capital to fields where it may be more profitably invested must be injurious: and that there was no doubt that the absence of a common monetary standard between England and its colonies on the one hand, and its Eastern Empire on the other, produces these evils. By introducing an element of uncertainty it puts difficulties in the way of honest and legitimate trade, and makes business risky. With regard to the future, it was pointed out that Government might profitably turn their attention to the possibility of a succession duty, which was a tax unobjectionable in principle, and which would yield a considerable income if a working scheme could be devised. With regard to expenditure on productive public works, it is necessary to test the capacity of the country to bear taxation before expenditure can be resolved on. The first position is to lay down with accuracy the economic condition of the people. The majority of the people are poor, but they cannot be considered poor in comparison with their wants. All over the country wages are steadily advancing—much more rapidly than the cost of living. Small agriculturists are prospering as they never did before. Manufacturing industries are slowly but surely extending. The prosperous condition of the people is favoured by the absorption of specie. The amount of revenue has increased in smaller proportion than the population. The pressure of taxation on the people is lighter than it ever was before; but for all that the Government of India are only in a position to borrow money for the development of their resources, provided always that in any expenditure incurred a clear return will be secured for the money spent. In the last three years about 50 lakhs of rupees have been laid out each year on canals. This amount is devoted partly to completing works under construction and mainly to three great canals. One of these is the Perigar Canal, in the Madras Presidency. The Secretary of State has accepted the proposals of the Government of India that a more liberal interpretation of the Councils Act may be allowed, and the Budget will come up each year for discussion as a matter of course. The members are at these discussions also to have the right of interpellation, and may be permitted to ask questions in reference to current matters of domestic as distinguished from those of imperial interest which may have attracted the interest of the public, except that no answer will be given to questions to which on political or military grounds no answer should be afforded. It would prove a great advantage to the Administration, as it would frequently be a satisfaction to members of Council and the public at large, if reasonable opportunities were afforded of communicating to those interested the exact facts in

regard to any questionable matter. In England the right of putting questions in Parliament is practically unlimited: it is a privilege which is occasionally abused for party purposes, but it is one which is justly regarded as too precious to be curtailed. It is the outcome of many centuries of constitutional government, and an educated public opinion demands that it shall be freely exercised. But in India the conditions are entirely different. Representative government is still a dream of the future, and the form of the administration remains in a great degree autocratic; public opinion, save in a few large towns, is an unknown quantity; but there are a multitude of Imperial interests to be guarded by the executive, apart from matters of local concern. For the Government of India, therefore, to commit itself to granting the right of interpellation of Parliamentary lines is obviously impossible.

Fourteen years have passed since the law relating to Indian post and post-dues was last consolidated. This year a new Act for again consolidating as well as amending the law relating to post and post-dues was enacted. In the beginning of the year the Fraudulent Merchandise Marks Bill was passed. It relates not only to piece-goods, but to all merchandise. It deals with three classes of offences: the imitation of trade-marks; the application to goods of false descriptions; and the trading in falsely marked goods. As regards the imitation of trade-marks, the Bill followed the provisions of the Indian Penal Code. As regards trade descriptions, the main provisions of the Merchandise Marks Act of England have been adopted. With regard to prevention, the proposed amendments of the Sea Customs Act are the most efficient weapon for the land authorities. Clauses have been added requiring, in the case of imported goods, that the real length should be stamped thereon in standard yards before shipment, and in the case of Indian goods before removal from the factory.

The North-West Patwari (village accountant) Bill passed this year was a measure to re establish the Patwari rate or cess to pay village accountants. Up to 1882 this tax has been levied, but was remitted in that year, with the result that the taxation of the North-West Provinces and Oude was diminished by more than 30 lakhs of rupees. It was really a levy to meet services rendered to the landlords. The Legislative Council decided to impose a rate of 4 per cent. instead of 6 per cent. on the revenue in the North-West Provinces, and a rate of 3 per cent. in Oude. The landlords and tenants, as well as Government, have a substantial interest in the accuracy of the village records.

Among other Acts passed this year may be mentioned: 1. The Lower Burma Village Bill, the main object of which is to define, and where it has fallen into abeyance to restore, the village organisation which was found in existence in Lower and in Upper Burma when we annexed the country. 2. The Central

Provinces Land Revenue Bill, the purport of which is to settle the rights as between landlord and tenant over land which has been cultivated for twelve years or for six years, to enable the settlement officer to inquire into the claims of the tenant farmers, and if it is proved that they were in possession at the last settlement, or have established their villages or effected substantial improvements at their own cost, to provide for their protection against arbitrary enhancement or ejection, to introduce the system of direct settlement with the occupier for the payment of the revenue as in the Bombay Presidency, and finally to settle the extent of proprietary rights granted in forest land. 3. The Central Provinces Village Conservancy Bill, which is an attempt to associate the village community with the head man of the village in the work of sanitation, and thus to place it on a popular basis. A village council is to be formed, and they, in association with the head man, are to determine the sum which will be required for the conservancy of the village, the provision and maintenance of a good water supply, the maintenance of village communications, and if the inhabitants so desire, the aiding of the village school. 4. The Cantonments Bill, a measure meant to check the scourge which is rapidly impairing the efficiency of the army and ruining the health of the soldiers. 5. The Official Secrets Bill. The offences which it is intended to reach are (a) the wrongful obtaining of information in regard to any matter of State importance; (b) the wrongful communication of such information. 6. The Metal Tokens Bill was framed with the object of putting a stop to the circulation of copper coins not being coins of the Empire, by prohibiting the making of pieces of metal by private persons for use as money and the putting such pieces of money into circulation for the first time. It was proposed during the course of the year by some Manchester cotton manufacturers that the provisions of the English Factory Act should be applied in their entirety to India. A large meeting of the mill-owners' association was held in Bombay to protest against any such legislation, and the facts and arguments adduced seemed to lead to the conclusion that the present state of the Indian factory law does not press hard on the operatives, as the labour of the Indian is so much lighter than that of the English mill-hand.

CHINA.

The trade of China with foreign countries presented a still further decline in the export of tea, the quantity brought to England showing a decrease in value of more than 700,000*l.* compared with 1888. Indian and Ceylon teas seemed to be preferred in England, and Japan teas in the United States of America, the competition with which seriously affected the Chinese tea trade. The tea leaf has not deteriorated in China; but

since Indian, Ceylonese, and Japanese growers have taken so much greater pains in preparing and shipping their teas, they keep better, and they can be sold cheaper because the Chinese teas are burdened with an export duty from which the Indian and Ceylon teas are exempt. Changes in the trade have also taken place in consequence of the opening up of a sea route, so that now Russian buyers get their tea direct from Hankow, instead of, as formerly, through London. Therefore, although the shipments to England have continued to decline, it is by no means certain that the production of China tea in the aggregate is decreasing.

As regards the silk industry in China, the exports of raw silk have varied in the last ten years from a minimum of 51,772 piculs (a picul being $133\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.) in 1885, to a maximum of 80,170 piculs in 1880, the average being about 65,000 piculs. The trade in wild silk increased from 4,289 piculs in 1879 to 13,868 piculs in 1886. In 1888 the export amounted to nearly 73,000 piculs. The export of silk cocoons has fluctuated greatly. In 1879 it was 4,818 piculs; in 1885, 1,324 piculs; in 1887, 11,092 piculs; and in 1888, 8,981 piculs. Of silk piece-goods the export has steadily risen from 13,808 piculs in 1872 to 23,016 in 1888. The home consumption of silk is reported to be twice that of the quantity exported. This important industry employs a large number of persons in tending mulberry trees, feeding silkworms, in spinning and weaving, and in the wholesale and retail silk trade. Agriculture is, however, the chief occupation of the 980,000,000 in China, the proportion thus engaged being 1 in 10 of the entire population, whilst 1 man in 100 is a bricklayer or mason, 1 in 120 a tailor, 1 in 140 a blacksmith, and 1 in 100 a carpenter.

The production of opium in Manchuria appears to be on the increase. West of the Liao River half of the arable land is given up to it. Chinese from the south have the management of the business, and go over the ground advancing money to the small farmers and supplying them with poppy seed. The cultivation is likely to increase annually, as the poppy is a hardy crop which always obtains a ready and profitable market.

Efforts were made during the year to restore and develop the mining production of the Yunnan and Kweichow provinces, which had been much neglected. The copper mines of North-Eastern Yunnan and the lead mines of Kweichow were thoroughly examined, and received the attention of mining experts from Japan. The development of the iron mines near Kweichow was also vigorously attempted. Machinery and plant were purchased in England, and furnaces were set for smelting the ore. The iron produced here is said to be soft or flexible and tough. The lead mines in the same region are being examined with a view to an increased development. The silver mines in Mongolia were producing a large quantity of good ore, and smelting and refining furnaces were employing several hundred natives and a few

foreigners. Lately the gold placer fields on the Mo River, a small tributary of the Amoor, have attracted considerable attention. They are situated at an immense distance from any towns or settlements in a desolate part of Northern Manchuria. An official sent by the governor of the Amoor provinces to examine the mines reported that, although the difficulties in reaching the place were very great, the gold there was so plentiful that it would repay all efforts. A company was formed and attempts were made, with ill-success, to borrow money of the foreign bankers at Tientsin and Shanghai with which to work the mines. The Chinese Government at last had to provide the necessary funds, Li Hung Chang and the Governor of the Amoor provinces furnishing 30,000*l.* for the needful working expenses.

The terrible famine in China, of which news came at the close of the year 1888, proved to be more disastrous than at first reported. Following the Yellow River disaster so suddenly, the Chinese Government found the greatest difficulty in getting the means to cope with it, as the inundations had involved an expense of two-and-a-half millions sterling in repairing the breach caused by the overflow of the river. Over one million people perished in the famine of 1888, which was less widespread in comparison and less appalling in magnitude. In this later famine women and children perished in thousands by the wayside, while the starving men were helpless to assist them. The famine was very severe in Shantung and Anhui, and extended through Honan, Kiangsu, and Shenking. In the neighbourhood of the city of Tsinan, owing to the floods, a large number of houses fell, and in some villages scarcely a house remained standing. The people were living in boats made from the *débris* of their houses. They were without suitable clothing, and kept themselves alive on a mixture of grain, chaff, and wheat sprouts. The missionaries did very much to relieve the distress in all the affected districts, and an appeal to the Lord Mayor of London was promptly met by his opening a subscription at the Mansion House, through which a handsome amount of money was raised in behalf of the suffering Chinese. The combination of floods and droughts caused this famine to be more than usually severe, and the loss of life resulting was proportionately great.

One of the surprises of the year was the course adopted by the Chinese Government respecting the building of railways in that country. In January the project for the construction of a short line of railway between Tientsin and Peking was abandoned, owing to the opposition of the conservative advisers of the Emperor. The chief objection of the Chinese to railways through their country seems to be that they are apt to disturb the graves of their ancestors, near or remote, and require frequently the demolition of houses. The recent failure of the small railway to Tunghow, which was peremptorily stopped by the Emperor, seemed to indicate that China was not prepared for railways,

but the policy of that enlightened statesman the Viceroy Li Hung Chang has finally prevailed, and China is to have a grand trunk line of railway extending southward 700 miles from Peking to Hankow, on the Yangtze River. Hankow is one of the treaty ports, where the foreign trade amounts to about eleven millions sterling per annum. The Emperor, before taking this most important step, sought advice from the viceroys and governors of provinces, and from certain high military officers, who reported generally in favour of the railway. Among the officials appealed to were Chang-Chih-tung, late Viceroy of Canton and now Viceroy of the Hu provinces, and Liu Ming Chuan, the Governor of Formosa. Chang was opposed to the Tungehow railway from strategic motives, but decided in favour of the great trunk line because, among other reasons, the disturbance of graves and houses would be small. He was in favour of the use of Chinese iron and other materials, which protective policy, if adopted, may result in the construction of a line inferior to one built of foreign and better materials. Liu Ming Chuan reported in favour of the immediate construction of the rejected railway to Tungehow. "Even," said he, "if the houses and graves have to be disturbed, this must be done for the good of the many." His arguments are surprisingly in accord with Western ideas, for he goes on to say that no modern invention does more to make a country rich and powerful than the railway. As to the danger of a railway bringing an enemy up to the walls of the capital, the capitals of Europe are connected by lines of rail, and none of them have been invaded any more in consequence. He would have liked a railway to run down from Peking towards Shanghai, so as to avoid the dangerous voyage by sea round the Shantung promontory. Because their ancestors did not have railways was no argument against them, he considered, for it was necessary to move with the times, and as in war they could not go back to the bows and arrows of their ancestors, or in peace to the nine square communal divisions of land, so railways, although an innovation, were a necessity. He referred to the Russian railway extending to the Amoor, and advised that they should make themselves strong against any possible aggression while they had time, and that they could not take a better means to that end than by an extension of railways in their own country. It is probable that seven or eight years will be spent in the construction of this grand trunk line, which has already been styled the "Great Western Railway of China." For the construction of the railway Li Hung Chang, who is the most influential man connected with the enterprise, does not propose to borrow any large sum abroad, but will borrow enough only to construct each successive section. The failure of the Tientsin line to Tungehow was really due to the hostility of a crowd of officials who made large illicit profits by the transport of the tribute rice from the Yangtze provinces between Tientsin and Peking.

The marriage of the youthful Emperor Kwang-su was celebrated at Peking in February with great festivities. The Emperor, who is but seventeen years of age, is descended from the sovereigns who ruled over Manchuria before the establishment of the dynasty in Peking in 1644. He is said to be of a quiet disposition, but very obstinate. His head is large, and he has a thin pointed face. He has a serious hesitation in his speech, and speaks slowly and with much difficulty. The Prime Minister of China, Prince Chun, is the Emperor's father, and it is said that the son does not approve of his father's position. Some fourteen years ago Prince Chun, who was not then Prime Minister but yet a powerful personage, addressed a secret memorial to the Empress Dowager, which has lately been published. In this document he sets forth what he considers should be the position of the father of an Emperor who has succeeded to the throne by adoption, and he asks that invidious proposals for his own advancement should be strongly repressed by the Empress Dowager. He desires that no honours be given him on any account, and that persons proposing them should be considered as dangerous to the State, and be treated with ignominy. He also requested that this document should be held back from publication until the Emperor should assume personal control of the Government.

Permission was finally granted in June by the Chinese Government to Mr. Archibald Little to attempt the ascent of the Upper Yangtze by steamer from Ichang to Chungking. Every possible obstacle had been put in the way of this enterprise by Chinese officials for several years, although the right to attempt the navigation of the river was conceded to British subjects by treaty of the Chefoo Convention in 1877.

In Chinkiang, on the Yangtze, a terrible riot took place in February, arising from a very insignificant cause. A member of the Sikh police, employed by the Municipal Council of the foreign quarter, had a dispute with a Chinaman who acted as an interpreter at the American Consulate. When brought to the police station the Chinaman complained that he had been ill treated by the policeman, but a medical examination proved his statement to be false. A crowd collected, and on leaving the station the Chinaman fell down pretending to be very ill and dying. The mob raised the cry that the policeman had killed him, and attacked the station, the police flying for their lives. The rioters then turned their attention to the British Consulate, which they set on fire, while the consul and his family had barely time to escape. The American Consulate was next attacked, but, being surrounded by Chinese houses, it was not set on fire, although everything movable was stripped from the building. The authorities made some feeble and futile efforts to quell the disturbance, while private houses, chapels, and warehouses were pillaged and burnt. Finally, telegrams were sent

•

to Shanghai for help, and H.M.S. *Mutine* sailed for Chingkiang. The authorities meanwhile had sent a large body of troops into the foreign quarter of the city, which was completely in ruins. It is supposed that some Chinese soldiers were at the bottom of the disturbance, as for some reason a camp had long existed immediately behind the foreign settlement, and had been a cause of much annoyance to Europeans. A riot of less importance occurred at Hankow in July, which was caused by a collision of students with the police. A good many bricks were thrown, and some foreigners were hit, but as the mob had no leaders and no special plan of attack, the Hankow settlement was not destroyed.

Indo-China (Tonquin, &c.)—Affairs in Tonquin at the beginning of the year were far from being in a settled state. Tu-yuet, the ex-regent of Annam, who escaped from Hué in 1886, was still uncaptured, and having entered China was recruiting a large force with which to enter Tonquin at Caobang. The Chinese frontier authorities were conniving at his designs. The increase of piracy in the north-east of the Red River delta was regarded as owing to his presence in the neighbourhood. A rebel chief was captured near Nam-dinh, and executed, and another was seized after sharp resistance in the Bac-ninh province. A force of rebels under this chief had fortified themselves in a village which was captured after a siege, the French officer in command being wounded. In Haidzuong province, Colonel Servières burned to the ground a large town notorious for sheltering pirates and rebels. On the Claire River, Captain Barre had engagements with the pirates, and returned to Sontay after dislodging numerous bands of Chinese which infested the locality, but after his departure the pirates returned and fortified their former position. A new column was sent against them, but it met with such resistance that it had to send for reinforcements. In the Hanoi province a large force of rebels fortified themselves and were driven out with difficulty by the French troops. While the resistance to the French has ceased to be very serious, the country remains in a very disordered condition. A pitched battle took place, Jan. 17, between a French column under General Borguis Desbordes and a force said to be Chinese which had fortified itself in a position near Thai-nguyen; the fight began at 8 a.m. and lasted till 2 p.m. Although the rebels were at last driven out the losses of the French were considerable. One officer and twelve men were killed, and six officers and sixty men were wounded. In April the fighting was still going on against the guerillas, who appeared to be recruited from China.

In January the Grand Council and Annamite Court elected Bun Lan, son of the former king, Tu Duc, as King of Annam, and he was crowned Feb. 1. As he is only ten years old, he governs under a regency consisting of members of the Grand Council. His accession was well received by the Annamite

dignitaries, and on taking the throne as Emperor he assumed the name of Than Khai.

Formosa.—The contest between the Chinese authorities and the natives of the island was still kept up in Northern Formosa, and considerable fighting took place between the contending parties. In other parts of the island the Chinese officers in command bought the submission of the aboriginal tribes, and wrote reports of mythical victories, ascribing the supervening peace to their own valour and judgment.

HONG KONG.

Of this colony, at the close of the year, the governor, Sir G. W. Des Vœux, gave, in his report, a glowing account of its condition and progress. The price of land continued to rise, and, with regard to the finances of the colony, a substantial increase in the revenue was made.

The privileges allowed to foreign mail steamers in colonial ports of the status of men-of-war gave rise to an incident in the harbour of Hong Kong which illustrated how these privileges may be abused.

A debtor, who was believed to be absconding, took a passage on board of the Messageries Maritimes steamer *Calédonien*; a writ of attachment was obtained against him and endorsed by the French consul, the ship, in accordance with the privilege granted to it, being French soil. But when the bailiff of the court went on board to execute the writ the captain treated the document with contempt, refused to allow it to be served, and threatened to have the bailiff forcibly removed. An officer of a French man-of-war which happened to be in the harbour was called in, a scene ensued, and the absconding passenger was put on shore, but not, it would appear, by virtue of the writ of the Hong Kong court. At a subsequent meeting of the Legislative Council, the Governor referred to the incident as one which could not be permitted to pass. Justice, he said, would not have taken its course but for the accident of a French man-of-war being in the harbour, which was not the case ten months in the year. The incident presented in a very strong light the inconvenience suffered in the colony by the operation of the Act passed under pressure from the Home Government, and he hoped that, with the assistance given by that incident to the colony's views of the case, the Act would be allowed to lapse in future, or, at all events, that certain regulations as to the arrangements with the French mail steamers would be arrived at, and would prevent the English laws from not operating in an English harbour." The mercantile view was that these privileges, including peculiar rights as to discharging cargo at night, freedom from the jurisdiction of the local courts, and other privileges, gave the foreign

steamers solid advantage in British ports over British vessels competing with them, and also add immensely to their prestige in the eyes especially of native shippers.

JAPAN.

The Mikado of Japan in 1881 announced his purpose to introduce a system of representative government in his dominions, and to establish a parliament, and fixed upon the year 1889 as the date of this change. He proposed to give up the pure despotism which had existed from the earliest times in Japan, and to present to his people as a free and gracious gift a portion of the unlimited power which has been held by the Mikados for so many centuries, stipulating, however, himself in what manner this power should be employed. A system of local elective assemblies was introduced some years before, which worked well, and it was thought that the same system might be extended to the Imperial Government with like success. In framing the new constitution, that of Prussia was the model most closely followed. The anniversary of the birth of the Emperor Jimmu Tenno, Feb. 11, who was the founder of this most ancient dynasty, and who began to reign in the year 600 B.C., was chosen by the Mikado as an auspicious day on which to ratify his imperial vow and to proclaim the constitution. Previous to the ceremony of promulgation, the Emperor executed a solemn oath in the Palace Sanctuary by which he swore, in the names of the great founder of his House and of his other imperial ancestors, that he would maintain and secure from decline the ancient form of government, and that he would always be an example to his subjects in the observance of the new laws. Then, after a short speech delivered with great dignity, his Majesty publicly presented the laws to Count Kuroda, his Minister President of State. These are five in number, and are entitled respectively the Constitution of the Empire of Japan, the Imperial Ordinance concerning the House of Peers, the Law of the Houses, the Law of Election for the members of the House of Representatives, and the Law of Finance. In the first, one salient and interesting feature is the care taken to affirm with emphatic brevity the time-honoured doctrines of the sanctity of the Emperor's title and the immutability of his dynasty. The Emperor is to remain the source of all laws, in that without Imperial approval no parliamentary measures can become law, the making of laws is to be the function of the Diet, and no law can be put into force without its assent, the one exception on the latter point being that the Emperor reserves the power of issuing ordinances in urgent cases, on behalf of the public safety or welfare, when the Diet is not sitting, but that such ordinances, to remain law, must be approved at the next parliamentary session. In succeeding articles it is laid down that the Emperor determines the organisation of every branch of

the administration, appoints and dismisses all civil and military officers, and fixes their salaries; that he has the supreme command of the army and navy, and determines their organisations and peace standing; and that it is he who makes war or peace, concludes treaties, confers titles of nobility, rank, orders, and other marks of honour, and grants amnesties, pardons, and commutation of punishment. The rights and duties of subjects are next set forth. By these it is determined, among other things, that a Japanese subject, while amenable to taxation or to service in the army or navy, shall be free from all illegal arrest, detention, trial, or punishment; that, subject in every case to the provisions or limits of the laws, he shall have liberty of abode and of change of abode; that his house shall not be entered or searched against his will; that the secrecy of his letters and all his rights of property shall be inviolate; and that he shall enjoy freedom of religious belief, consistently with the duties of the subject and the preservation of peace and order, as well as liberty of speech, writing, publication, public meeting, and association.

The parliamentary system is to consist of a House of Peers and a House of Representatives, called together the Imperial Diet, and holding an ordinary annual session of three months—which, however, may be extended by Imperial order—and extraordinary sessions in urgent cases. The first session is to take place next year—rumour says in the autumn—and the new constitution is to come into force from the time of the Diet's opening. For the Upper House there are four classes of members. First, members of the Imperial family on reaching their majority, and princes and marquises on attaining the age of twenty-five; these hold office for life. Secondly, counts, viscounts, and barons of not less than twenty-five years, and in numbers not exceeding one-fifth of the whole number of those orders; these are to be elected by their fellows for a term of seven years. Thirdly, members nominated for life by the sovereign, for meritorious services to the State, or for erudition, and above the age of thirty. Fourthly, forty-five commoners, elected in the prefectures and urban districts—one for each—by the fifteen largest taxpayers in the electoral area, and appointed for a term of seven years, if approved by the Emperor. It is further laid down that the number of members in the last two classes shall not exceed that in the first two. For the Lower House there are to be 300 members, elected by ballot in 258 electoral districts, as defined in an appendix. The suffrage is limited to males not less than twenty-five years old, who must have resided in the district for at least a year before registration and be still resident, and have paid in the district for a similar period, and be still paying, direct national taxes to the amount of not less than fifteen Japanese dollars, and, besides, have paid income-tax for three years, and be still paying it. Candidates for election must be full thirty years old, and must possess similar qualifications to the above as tax-

payers, but without the condition of residence. Several classes of officials are excepted, as well as Shinto priests and all teachers of religion; while, in addition to obvious disqualifications in the cases of public offenders and others, no one serving in or temporarily retired or suspended from the army or navy can either vote or be elected. Four years, which is the House's limit of life, is also the limit of membership. But the former may be dissolved at any time by Imperial order, and a new Assembly convoked within a period of five months. For each House there are to be, besides a chief and other secretaries, a president and a vice-president nominated by the Emperor, with annual salaries of \$4,000 and \$2,000 respectively; while the commoners in the Upper House and all members of the Lower House, those in the Government service excepted, are to receive \$800 per annum. Among a host of other general provisions, it is laid down, for both Houses, that, except in special cases, for which rules are provided, all debate shall be public; that the president is to have a casting vote; that the necessary quorum for any debate or vote is to be one-third of the whole number of members; that Cabinet Ministers and Government Delegates—the "Government" meaning the Emperor and his Cabinet—may sit and speak in either House, but not vote therein unless they are members of it; and, further, that, whenever the Emperor may present to the Diet any project for amendment of the constitution, no debate thereon can take place unless two-thirds at least of the members are present, and no amendment can be carried by less than a two-thirds majority.

As regards finance, the Diet is to discuss and vote the Budget, and its approval is required in respect of any excesses upon the appropriations, as well as of national loans or other liabilities to the Treasury. Its powers are, nevertheless, a good deal circumscribed. For example, the outlay of the Imperial household, as well as the entire peace appropriations for the army and navy, the salaries of officials, and all expenditures that "may have arisen by the effect of law," or that "appertain to the legal obligations of the Government," are practically removed from parliamentary control. It is also provided that, in urgent cases arising out of the internal or external condition of the country, and when the Diet cannot be convoked, the necessary financial measures may be taken under Imperial ordinances; and, again, that the Government may carry out the Budget of a preceding year whenever a Budget has not been voted or brought into existence. The Privy Council is, as heretofore, to deliberate on important matters of State, at the instance of the Emperor; and the ten Ministers of State remain his Majesty's responsible advisers; and as to the Judicature, there is a satisfactory provision that the judges, appointed by the Crown, can only be removed from their office by law.

The public promulgation of the constitution took place in

the splendid new palace, in presence of a great assemblage representing the power, wealth, intellect, and high lineage of the country, as well as all classes of the people, and with the pomp and solemnity befitting the occasion. Public rejoicings and festivities followed, the parks and gardens were illuminated, and the people universally showed their appreciation of the great boon which the Emperor had conferred upon them.

During the ceremonies attendant on the declaration of the new constitution, Viscount Mori Arinori, the Minister of Public Instruction, was assassinated by a fanatical priest who had a grievance in regard to some decision of the Minister. Viscount Mori had held the posts of Japanese Minister in China, in England, and the United States. He had always taken a keen interest in educational matters, and was desirous of introducing Western methods of education into Japan. He was in favour of the use of Roman letters in writing Japanese, instead of the complicated and difficult system in vogue, based on the Chinese system of writing.

The question of the revision of treaties with foreign nations became more important in view of the new position taken by Japan as a constitutional Government. Treaties were made with Japan in 1858 which were suited to those times, but they contained provisions humiliating to that country. The intercourse of Western nations with Japan since then has been conducted on the principle of extra-territoriality. Foreigners have been admitted to certain treaty ports, and their relations with Japanese subjects have been regulated by the consular jurisdiction of the different nationalities concerned. When congratulated by the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce on the successful promulgation of the new constitution, Count Okuma, the Foreign Secretary, said that one national aspiration yet remained to be satisfied, viz.: the revision of the treaties. Count Okuma was the former head of the powerful Progressionist party, and is recognised as one of the ablest of Japanese statesmen. The fact that he had taken in hand the revision of the treaties, supported by the entire nation and the Government, gave promise of success. A conference of the several Powers interested was held at Tokio in 1886-87 with the object of giving greater international equality between Japan and the treaty Powers; but it proved abortive. Japan, by the existing treaties, had covenanted that whatever privileges she might grant to any Power should be "freely and equally participated in" by all the signatories of the treaties. To this an arbitrary interpretation was attached that, if one Power purchased privileges on certain conditions, all the others became entitled to claim the same privileges unconditionally. Japan, failing to secure the action of the Powers collectively, appealed to them individually. An immediate response came from the United States, a nation always most friendly to Japan, and a commercial treaty was signed in Feb-

ruary. By the general principles laid down by the Japanese Government this treaty provided that after a certain date all foreigners, being subjects of any Power which had entered into a treaty for the purpose, would be freely permitted to travel, trade, reside, and own real property in every part of the Empire, provided that in the exercise of these privileges they became wholly subject to Japanese jurisdiction. The treaty settlements would retain their privileges for a limited period, at the expiration of which they would fall under the general provisions of the new treaty, as specified above. The Japanese Government would further undertake, not by treaty, but by diplomatic understanding, to hold good for a certain term of years, to appoint competent foreign judges to sit with Japanese judges in the Supreme Court of Japan, such foreign judges to be in a majority in all cases in which foreigners are concerned; and, finally, a similar diplomatic understanding would provide that a new Civil Code, which has been for some time in process of elaboration on an approved basis of Western jurisprudence, should be promulgated and brought into operation at least three years before the time fixed for the determination of the existing privileges of the treaty settlements, and that an authorised English translation of the code should be published a year and a half before the same date.

A treaty had previously been made with Mexico on terms of absolute equality. During the year treaties were arranged with Russia, Germany, and Italy, and negotiations with Great Britain and France were progressing. The Powers that have wisely made new treaties with Japan have given their citizens the right to enjoy entire freedom of trade, travel, and residence in any part of Japanese territory. The revision of the existing treaties is important, because the foreign commerce of Japan is growing with astonishing rapidity. Ten years ago it was only one-seventh of China's commerce; now it is already one-half that commerce, with the prospect of equality in a very few years.

While these negotiations were progressing, public opinion in Japan became much exercised on the subject of treaty revision. Objection was taken to the appointment of four foreign judges, which was declared to be contrary to a clause of the new constitution, and another bone of contention was the permission granted to foreigners to hold land in the interior. A monster demonstration of the people against the plan of treaty revision was held (Aug. 20) in one of the chief theatres of Tokio, the capital, which lasted three days, and the meeting was addressed by nearly fifty speakers.

The Japanese estimates for the current financial year were published in May. They showed a total revenue of \$76,600,000, and an expenditure of \$76,596,000. The land-tax was estimated to yield \$42,248,900; the income-tax \$1,053,500, and the tax on rice-beer brewing \$14,497,400. Under the head of expenditure

the Imperial household was put down for \$3,000,000, the national debt for \$20,000,000, and the various public departments for a total of \$65,990,890; the total extraordinary expenditure amounting to \$10,605,400.

Among the indications of the desire of the Japanese to follow the best European models in the ordering of their new Parliament was the arrival in London in October of a commission despatched by the legislative department, to study the rules of parliamentary procedure in various countries, especially England, France, Italy, Austria, Germany, and Belgium; also the etiquette, the functions of the various permanent officials, the reporting of the debates, and the methods of admitting the public to hear them, and in general the rules, regulations, and organization of European legislatures.

It is evident that the Japanese are fully alive to the importance of protecting their foreign trades. At a meeting of the Tokio Chamber of Commerce in March there were present a number of officials connected with trade, including consuls, the directors of the commercial Bureau in the department of Agriculture, officials of the Foreign Office, and others. The custom of surrounding officials with ceremonies that rendered them difficult of access to the mercantile classes was deprecated. The industry shown by consuls in preparing elaborate statistical returns was commended, but the opinion was expressed that the uses of such statistics were comparatively trifling, and that mercantile interests would be better served by expeditious and frequent reports of events calculated to affect the markets. Reference was made by the Consul-General to London to the import of cotton yarn into Japan, which in 1887 amounted to 8,000,000 pieces, and in 1888 was still larger; but this trade was conducted entirely by foreign merchants in Yokohama and Kobe. He thought this business ought to be managed by Japanese agents abroad. At this meeting a prominent official announced that four or five more foreign consulates were about to be established, chiefly for the purpose of obtaining and circulating information as to the state of foreign commerce.

A succession of disastrous storms and floods between April and September visited the country almost without intermission. During the latter half of April, Yezo and the Shimane, Nügata, and Shiga prefectures were visited by inundations. In Yezo many houses and cattle were destroyed, and along the shores of Lake Biwa the fertile rice lands were under water. In June frightful rain storms took place along the west coast, and the rivers filled, while a strong westerly wind forced the sea up their mouths, so that the water spread all over the country. In these floods, in one prefecture alone, 12,000 acres of land under crops were buried under mud and sand, and 1,200 houses were destroyed. In July, in the southern island of Kiushiu, the Chikugo River overflowed its banks and wrought havoc in the Oita prefec-

ture. About 4,000 acres of cultivated land were devastated, over twenty miles of embankments were swept away, roads were rendered impassable, and business had to be suspended everywhere. Later on in July, Hiroshima prefecture, on the Inland Sea, was visited in a similar way with similar disastrous results. But the floods of August were worse than all the others put together. In South-eastern Japan the calamity was so great and widespread that the nation was fairly roused. In Kiushiu, the Chikugo River (the largest in that island) again flooded a large tract of country, the water rising $28\frac{1}{2}$ feet above its usual level, and this it did twice in succession in three weeks. Thirty-three thousand three hundred and seventy-two houses were submerged, 2,741 bridges were swept away, 130 miles of embankments destroyed, and 73,694 persons were thrown on the world without adequate sustenance. In the south-eastern part of the main island 1,247 persons were killed, being mostly swept out to sea before help could be rendered. On Sept. 11 a terrible gale swept over Northern Japan, and the sea was forced over the embankments in various places along the coast and covered the surrounding country. The totals of the official returns so far are:—12 prefectures devastated, 2,419 persons killed, 155 wounded, over 90,000 deprived of the means of subsistence, over 50,000 houses swept away or submerged, 150,000 acres of crops destroyed, about 6,000 bridges washed away, and hundreds of miles of roads broken up. For thirty years no such calamity, or succession of calamities, has overtaken Japan. Japan is frequently afflicted with earthquakes, and this year it was not exempt. In July a dreadful earthquake occurred in the western portion of the island of Kiushiu, the most southern of the three great Japanese islands, by which the town of Kumamoto was destroyed and a great number of people perished. The centre of the earthquake was Mount Knipo, in a chain of volcanoes connected with Mount Aso, one of the most noted volcanoes in the country.

On the morning of July 28, the day of the destructive shock, the weather was agreeably cool, but at twilight the sky was clothed with a dark cloud, tinged with a pale reddish colour, and the atmosphere became quite close. About ten minutes past 11 P.M. a noise as of thunder was heard. Simultaneously a strong earthquake movement commenced. As the nature of the shock was unusual, some of the inhabitants dressed, while others, with scarcely any covering, rushed from their houses, a number of them only to be crushed to death by falling walls and trees.

The castle of Kumamoto, which was the scene of the memorable siege by General Haigo at the time of the Kagohima rebellion, and is noted for the solidity of its structure, was damaged in several parts. In the streets fissures appeared in several places, some of the cracks measuring six feet in width. In other parts of the town subsidences occurred; in some instances water was seen spouting from the fissures created by the seismological disturbance.

The reorganisation of the Japanese army, which was amongst

the earliest reforms undertaken by the Japanese Government after the revolution of 1868, was commenced with the aid of a number of French officers, of all arms and grades, who were lent for the purpose by the French Government. For a number of years they remained in the country, the places of those who retired being taken by others from France. A similar mission for organising the navy was lent by Great Britain. After the war of 1870 the Japanese tended more towards German military models, but the French officers were retained. Many leading Japanese officers were educated in Germany, amongst them being a Prince of the Imperial house. At length in 1884 German staff officers began to be engaged, the Japanese taking care that the spheres of operations of the French and Germans were quite distinct, and that the two nationalities did not come into contact. This state of things, however, was not satisfactory to the German Government, which is said to have feared a collision, and accordingly refused leave to its officers to continue in the Japanese service. Meanwhile the French Government put an end to the matter by peremptorily withdrawing every one of the officers comprising the mission, even though the terms of their respective engagements were not completed.

With regard to the religious condition of the Japanese people, it must be allowed that Christianity is becoming a vital element, and that every year its influence is increasingly felt. It has taken a strong hold on the minds of many of the most ardent, intellectual and influential men of the rising generation. The number of young converts is fast increasing, and this departure from the ancient faith of Buddhism has aroused the priests of that religion to renewed activity in expounding their doctrines, in founding schools, and in making every effort to stay the progress of Christianity. So much alarmed have the Buddhists become that they have attempted to charge Christianity with a want of reverence for the Emperor, and thus to prejudice the people against it. However, as a Japanese writer says, "Japan is putting away childish things, and among them Buddhism, which may once have been of use, but has outgrown that usefulness."

Changes were made in the Japanese ministry in December. Count Aoki became Minister of Foreign Affairs in the place of Count Okuma, who was created a Privy Councillor with the rank of Minister, and Count Iwamura was appointed Minister of Commerce. The most significant change was, however, that Count Yamagata Aritomo, heretofore Minister of the Interior, became the President of the Ministry.

COREA.

This kingdom, which has long been a vassal of China, has enjoyed during the year a fair measure of prosperity. The differences between Mr. Denny, the foreign adviser to the King,

and Yuan, the Chinese resident, gave rise to some trouble and disturbance, which was settled by the withdrawal of both. Mr. Denny, who had held this post by invitation of Li Hung Chang since 1885, retired, and Yuan was succeeded by two Chinese officials.

Mr. Denny during a visit to China took occasion to explain the condition of affairs in Corea. He defended the publication of his pamphlet, and said he was forced to write it to let the world know of the extraordinary conduct of the Chinese resident. He had a wish to preserve good feeling and harmony between China and Corea. He denied, however, that China had any right to claim, under international laws or usage or from their historical relations, vassalage from Corea, which had ever jealously preserved her independence and freedom from interference in her domestic as well as her international policy by her more powerful neighbour, and he hoped she would continue to preserve them. Referring to a treaty with a Manchu Prince in 1686, in which Corea is alleged to have acknowledged her vassalage, Mr. Denny said the treaty was concluded with a Prince in open rebellion against the ruling dynasty, and was ten years prior to the conquest of China by the Manchus.

Corean autonomy and the right of the country to develop her own resources in her own way are all that are wanted to assure the future of the country. The King is anxious for foreign intercourse, but can do little while the present political complications exist. Japanese policy since 1876 seemed to be directed to securing commercial advantages, and to wiping out the painful memories of ancient conflicts. No Western power, he thought, could obtain a paramount position in Corea without the greatest expense, trouble, responsibility, and sacrifice of life.

Mr. Denny also said that he believed that Corea had large gold deposits which would yield wealth to the country; and he alluded to the great timber tracts in the north as a most valuable property of the country.

Contrary to Mr. Denny's opinion, there may be some reason to think that Russia looks with longing eyes to the occupation of the Corean peninsula, and that her plan would be first to make trouble between Corea and China, accept Corea as an ally, and finally annex it.

The southern part of the peninsula suffered in the early months of the year from severe famine, caused by failure in the supply of the staple article of food—rice. The Government gave some relief, but it was totally inadequate to meet the case and relieve the suffering induced. Many hundred thousand people were included in the famine district. Strange to say, the Government rejected any assistance offered by foreigners, and the Foreign Office sent a message to that effect.

CHAPTER VI.

AFRICA.

EGYPT—SOUTH AFRICA—EAST AFRICA—WEST AFRICA—
CENTRAL AFRICA.

I. EGYPT AND THE SOUDAN.

HAPPY is the country that has no history! The last year of Anglo-Egyptian history is yet more uneventful than its predecessor, and at the same time more prosperous. The danger from the Soudan, it is true, is not over, and the restless inhabitants of that land of unrest seem to be as active as ever. The power of the Mahdist movement has been more strongly concentrated at Khartoum. The Abyssinian kingdom and Emin Pasha's equatorial province have alike been submerged by the Mahdist forces. The slave-trade is again dominant throughout the Soudan. But in spite of this activity beyond her borders, Egypt has not been seriously disturbed by the wars or conquerors of the Soudan. In the neighbourhood of Suakin the decisive victory which concluded the military records of last year has produced greater tranquillity and some revival of trade. The number of troops in Suakin has been largely diminished. New forts have been built and new negotiations opened with the surrounding sheikhs. The desultory fighting round about the fortress has gradually ceased. The roads and trade-routes have been to a large extent set free. In other quarters, at occasional intervals, the Dervishes have given more trouble. There has been a good deal of intermittent fighting in the neighbourhood of Wady Halfa and Assouan, calling for vigorous action on the part of the British and Egyptian troops, and in August a severe engagement took place at Toski, which resulted in the complete defeat of the Dervishes by General Grenfell. Fifteen hundred of the Dervishes were killed, and their chief, Wad el Njumi, among them. On the whole, however, although in the present condition of the Soudan it is impossible to look for entire tranquillity in these frontier districts, the security of the country would seem to have increased, and the fear of invasion or of any very formidable military operations threatening the security of Egypt appears steadily to diminish every year.

As regards the internal administration of the country, there is little but what is satisfactory to be said. The ministry of Riaz Pasha survives with increasing reputation. The policy of extending and developing the public works of the country goes steadily forward. Schemes have been set on foot and favourably considered for largely extending the railways, and the proposals adopted include the construction of some ninety miles of railway

from Assiout to Girgeh, and of three smaller lines in other directions, as well as the building of a railway bridge over the Nile. The cost of these railway works has been variously estimated, but it appears to involve the expenditure of a capital of at least 800,000*l*. It is intended that each line should, on its completion, be handed over to the Egyptian Railway Administration on a perpetual lease, and that the Egyptian Government should pay the constructors on certain fixed terms, and reserve to themselves the right to purchase the railways at any time hereafter. The Railway Board shows signs of increasing activity, and experience is gradually making amends for the want of technical knowledge on the part of some of its members. In its *personnel* there has been some slight change, owing to the resignation of M. Timmermann, the French member of the Board, on receiving an appointment at home. Some question arose at first on the appointment of his successor, because the French Government, with the disagreeable obstructiveness which in matters of Egyptian administration it unfortunately mistakes for national self-assertion, declined to consent to the wishes of the Egyptian Government and to permit a reduction of salary. The matter was, however, compromised by diplomatic intervention. Besides the railway extension, the Government have set on foot schemes for the improvement of the harbour of Alexandria, for the construction of tramways in Cairo, and for the better drainage of that city. Once again the Public Works Department have experienced some of the troubles of last year in being compelled to pay close attention to the vagaries of the Nile, and for a time, in the spring, the low level of the river occasioned a good deal of uneasiness. With the view of coping with these difficulties, further and larger plans have been formed for improving the system of irrigation. The Inspector-General of Irrigation has been employed in discussing the means of carrying out these plans in Upper Egypt, in the provinces of Esmeh, Keneh, Girgeh, and Southern Assiout; and it is to be hoped that they will result in the thorough irrigation of some 250,000 acres, which two years ago were irrigated insufficiently or not at all. Of course considerable fresh works will be necessary, as well as the prolongation of many of the existing canals.

Unfortunately, we have not succeeded much better than in previous years in allaying the irritability and jealousy of our French coadjutors in Egypt. Again and again, on small points as well as on large, the temper and attitude of the representatives of the French Government have tended to increase the difficulties of the situation, and to tie the hands of the Egyptian Administration. In February, when the quinquennial period of the mixed tribunals came to an end, France claimed, among other points, a double representation on the Court of Appeal as compared with any other Power; and it was only after considerable friction and discussion that her representatives admitted the principle of

equality between France and the other Powers, and agreed, in common with all the great Powers, upon the prolongation of the mixed tribunals for another period of five years. In other respects the same policy has been followed. France has not ceased to urge the diminution of the British force of occupation, and the evacuation of the country by our troops. As the public works have increased in importance, she has put forward claims for a larger share in the control of the works constructed. Even the friendly demonstrations at Cairo which greeted the visit of the Prince of Wales, and the cordial welcome shown him by all classes, afforded an opportunity for a display of jealousy which is below the dignity of a great Power.

In spite, however, of these difficulties, the Anglo-Egyptian Administration has steadily prospered. It has been found possible this year to abolish the Commissions formed four years ago in each province to cope with brigandage—a fact which bears witness not only to the decrease of brigandage, but also to the increased efficiency of the native Courts. With the view of strengthening the administration of justice, two English judges, Mr. J. Willmore and Mr. Cameron, have been appointed to sit in the Court which hears appeals from native tribunals. There is evidence that the slave-trade is practically extinguished; and the number of slaves still kept by private families is rapidly decreasing, owing to the influence of the Slaves' Home. A scheme for the employment of convict labour for the purpose of building prisons in the provinces has been set on foot. On all sides, and in every department, there are, among some failures which are of course inevitable, traces of increasing vitality and improvement, and a record of slow but encouraging success.

Even in the troubled atmosphere of Egyptian finance there are comforting gleams of improvement. At the end of January Lord Salisbury was able to congratulate Sir Edgar Vincent and the Egyptian Government on the brilliant success of their efforts in 1888. The hopes of the financial authorities had been surpassed by the result, and they found themselves in possession of a substantial surplus. Egypt now enjoys better credit than Russia, Austria, or Italy. A quarter of a million is annually applied to the abolition of the *corvée*. The instalments of the land-tax have been judiciously arranged so as to coincide with the harvests. The *octroi*, which bears very easily on the lower classes, has been abolished in the smaller towns. Some of the friction caused originally by the severe control established over the expenditure has died out by this time, and the appointment of the Finance Committee, a body without the consent of which no expenditure can be incurred, has been found to be both salutary and useful. Nor have the bright prospects with which the year opened been clouded since. In the spring, it is true, the economic condition of the country looked rather serious, owing to the low level of the Nile and the grave state of the

reserve fund, but the gloomy prognostications formed for the moment have since been completely disappointed. Mr. Palmer, Sir Edgar Vincent's successor, appears determined to continue the tradition of improvement, and, acting on his advice, the Egyptian Government have decided that they may venture at last to begin reducing the heavy weight of taxation. The proposals for next year's finances are a proof of the hopeful condition of the fiscal system. Mr. Palmer suggests several important reductions of taxes. He proposes, among other things, to suppress the professional tax in all but the largest towns, to abolish all octrois at Rosetta, to abolish generally the octroi on rice, and to abolish all weighing duties. He further proposes to introduce certain improvements into the postal system, to set aside a large sum for expenditure on the new railways, and to increase the education grant. It is anticipated that the deficit occasioned by these changes will be compensated by increased receipts from the land-tax, and by further economies in the Daira and Domains Administrations, and in some other departments of the public service. A large surplus is to be kept in hand for the reserve fund, and to guard against unforeseen expenses; but, even allowing for that and for the other changes introduced, the estimates forecast a surplus of 150,000*l*. Already the proposals for reduction of taxes have excited very general approval, and four provinces have sent up deputations to express to the Khedive their satisfaction at the relief afforded by the new Budget.

In one respect, however, Egyptian finance has this year had its disappointments. The cherished scheme of debt conversion still hangs suspended, owing to the obstructive opposition of the French Government. In February last the Egyptian Government, with the cordial consent of its English advisers, decided to take advantage of the improvement in its financial position to convert its five per cent. Privileged Debt into a new stock bearing interest at four per cent., in the hope of effecting thereby a saving of about 160,000*l*. or 170,000*l*. a year. The scheme found favour generally in the country, and, after some curious conflict of legal authorities on the subject, it was determined to send commissioners to London to negotiate the loan. The representatives of the Egyptian Government prospered in their enterprise, the new loan was arranged, and in May a decree was issued at Cairo sanctioning the issue of a four per cent. preference stock in accordance with the conversion scheme. Out of these new resources the Egyptian Government proposed to pay off last year's loan, and anticipated that they would be left with a large sum in hand to apply to the commutation of pensions and to irrigation works. The decree provided for the payment of a premium to the holders of existing preference stock, and stipulated that the new loan should not be redeemed by the Government for fifteen years. Further, the Government proposed to utilise the annual saving effected by the conversion in remitting the

sums now paid by the fellaheen for exemption from the *corvée* or forced labour. The objects of the conversion scheme were unquestionably useful, and the plan excited general satisfaction. But when the Egyptian Government submitted their decree to the approval of the Powers, France refused to give her consent, except on conditions involving the immediate evacuation of the country by British troops. With those conditions the Egyptian Government had not the means to comply, but the French Government persisted in their requirements, and consequently the whole scheme fell through. Since then strong pressure has been brought to bear on the French with the view of inducing them to forego their objection, but up to the close of the year the French Government had shown no inclination to yield. The failure of the conversion scheme necessitated fresh financial measures. The Egyptian Government were still very desirous of abolishing the payments for exemption from the *corvée*, which are the last remnants of a justly unpopular system. As the saving which they had hoped to effect by the conversion was no longer available for this purpose they determined to substitute a special tax in order to enable them to carry out their intention. Accordingly, in December, the Khedive summoned a general Assembly of the Legislative Assembly and Notables combined to consider the question, and proposed to that body to abolish all payments for exemptions from the *corvée* in future, and to supply the deficit, if the Powers agreed, by a conversion of the Privileged Debt, but if the Powers refused to consent to that, by a new and special land-tax averaging about three piastres per acre. The imposition and duration of the new tax thus depend entirely upon the action of France. If she consents to the conversion scheme the necessity for the new impost will cease. If, on the other hand, she persists in her refusal, she will be the direct means of imposing an additional tax on the poorest class of cultivators, and will reap the odium and unpopularity of a measure which her unjustifiable attitude alone has rendered necessary in Egypt.

II. SOUTH AFRICA.

Cape Colony.—The administration of the affairs of this colony by Sir Hercules Robinson as Governor and High Commissioner met with the approval of the vast majority of the people of the country, and as the time of the expiration of his term of office drew near strong hopes were expressed that he would be re-appointed. All sections of the Press in South Africa, representing the English, the Dutch, and the natives, were strongly in favour of his continuance in office. But it was definitely settled in January that he would leave Cape Colony in April. His departure for England was postponed, however, till May, when he left amidst universal tokens of regret and respect. At the farewell banquet given in his honour at Cape Town he made a speech

which was regarded by alarmists as very remarkable. "There are," said he, "three competing influences at work in South Africa. They are Colonialism, Republicanism, and Imperialism. As to the last, it is a diminishing quantity, there being no longer any permanent place in the future of South Africa for direct Imperial rule on any large scale." From this utterance he was supposed to advocate the immediate withdrawal from South Africa of the Imperial Government; but his subsequent remarks proved the contrary, for he went on to say that "all the Imperial Government can now do in South Africa is, by means of spheres of influence, protectorates, and Crown colonies, to gradually prepare the way for handing native territories over to the Cape and Natal, so soon as such transfers can be made with justice to the natives and advantage to all concerned." Sir Hercules at the banquet also said that his return as High Commissioner would depend on the approval of his views by the Home Government. The Dutch element predominates in the colony, and this has caused a certain amount of difference between the policy of the Imperial Government and that of the Colonial Government, rendering the dual office of Governor and High Commissioner a difficult one to fill. Sir Hercules Robinson conducted the affairs of the colony with signal ability and was one of the best colonial governors in the service of the Crown. After the post had been offered to one and another and had been refused, it was finally accepted by Sir Henry Loch, the Governor of Victoria, in June. It was fortunate for the colony that the services of such an able and experienced administrator were secured. The new Governor began his career as a soldier, and in India and in the Crimea distinguished himself. Afterwards in 1857, and again in 1860, he was attached to Lord Elgin's embassies in China. In 1863 he accepted the Governorship of the Isle of Man, and continued there for nineteen years. In 1884 he became Governor of Victoria, a position which he filled with tact and success.

The Cape Parliament was opened in May by General Smyth, the Administrator of the colony in the absence of the Governor. In his speech he referred to the satisfactory condition of the country. He declared that the relations with neighbouring states were most friendly; that the large coloured population in the native districts was absolutely peaceful; that crime was steadily decreasing; that every branch of industry was flourishing; and that the public finances were in a more prosperous state than had been noted for a long series of years. This speech was generally regarded as an optimistic expression of the position and policy of Sir Gordon Sprigg, the Premier. In June both Houses of the Cape Parliament passed the Convention tariff, fixing a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* rate.

The Cape imports for the year amounted to 10,841,454*l.*, and the exports to 8,644,536*l.*

Natal.—The trade returns for 1889 showed that the value of

imports advanced 28 per cent., and that of the exports 40 per cent. The combined values of the trade amounted to 4,300,000*l*. The Natal Council agreed in May to offer to construct, equip and work the railway from the Free State border to Harrismith. Sir Arthur Havelock, the Governor, sailed for England in June on leave of absence, and in August Sir Charles Mitchell was appointed as his successor.

Matabeleland.—Lobengula, the King of Matabeleland, to satisfy himself with regard to the existence of the "Great White Queen," sent two trusty envoys to England, who arrived in March. They were highly delighted with their reception by the Queen, and wished to return home as soon as possible to tell the King and his people of what they had seen as to the power and friendship of the English.

The father of Lobengula, Moselikatze, who was styled "the scourge of the Bechuanas," died in 1870. Since then Lobengula has reigned between the Zambezi and the Limpopo, and from Sofala to Bamangwato, undisturbed. The gold-seekers have of late gained a foothold in his territory, and the frontier Boers are giving him anxiety by their preparations for invading his land. Having sold their farms in the Transvaal at satisfactory prices, they are looking for other farms, and are ready to seize the fertile lands lying just across the border in Lobengula's domain. Although Great Britain has concluded a treaty of peace with Lobengula, and declared his territories to be solely within the sphere of her influence, the Transvaal Boers are not firmly held in check, as they care little for any authority, and unless the country is placed under British protection and a British resident sent to Lobengula's court, there will be difficulty in restraining the lawless Boers. Early in the year there were reports that 1,000 first-class rifles had passed through Kimberley and Bechuanaland on their way to Lobengula, and questions were asked in the Cape Parliament with regard to the matter, but no official contradiction or explanation was given.

A concession granted to an English syndicate by Lobengula, giving a monopoly of mining rights in Matabeleland and Mashonaland, was afterwards repudiated by the King on the ground that its meaning had not been properly explained. Other similar concessions previously granted by Lobengula have met the same fate.

Swaziland.—The King, Umbandine, having dismissed Mr. T. Shepstone from the post of official adviser, which he had held for two years, confided the management of affairs to a committee of white men to make laws for the whole population, to adjudicate in disputed cases, and to impose and receive taxes. Mr. Shepstone however declined to recognise his dismissal, on the ground that he was appointed by the nation. The King sent an envoy in March to the High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson, to ask for a proclamation of a British protectorate, but no decided

steps were taken towards annexation, possibly because of the opposition of Cape Colony and Natal, from fear of the establishment of a trade route to the coast through Swaziland. As far back as 1887, the King, aware of the dangers threatening him from adventurers anxious to get possession of his territory, asked for the appointment of a British resident, and offered to pay his salary, but the request was refused because her Majesty's Government considered that 'circumstances had not rendered desirable that form of interference with the internal affairs of Swaziland.' The white residents in the country, about 600 in number, despairing of any action by the Imperial Government, were beginning to favour annexation to the Transvaal, when Sir Francis de Winton was appointed in October a Special Commissioner from the Home Government to arrange some kind of settlement, and to confer with Commissioners from the Transvaal. By the British surrender of Swaziland and Amatongaland to the Transvaal, the Boers would obtain the much coveted access to the sea. The people of Amatongaland, however, were asking even more loudly than the Swazis for a British protectorate, and the difficulties of coming to any arrangement were great. Before Sir Francis de Winton arrived at the Cape the King, Umbandine, died, and his eldest son, Boon, was appointed his successor, with the Queen Regent to carry on the government during the minority of the young King. Mr. Shepstone was appointed by the Indunas to take charge of European interests; seventy chiefs, including Tecuba and the Queen Dowager, signing the appointment. In December, Sir Francis de Winton conferred with the Indunas respecting the concessions to miners, which they styled wicked documents demanding inquiry. Sir Francis replied that a large tribunal was contemplated in order to test the legality of the grants. This seemed to satisfy the chiefs. He also said that the first object of the Commission was to preserve the independence of the nation, and its first act was to recognise Umbandine's succession. Messrs. Joubert and Smit, the Transvaal Commissioners in Swaziland, declared in July that their only intention was to assist the King in maintaining his authority in conjunction with the British Commissioner.

Bechuanaland.—The question whether this colony should be administered under direct British rule, or should come under the Government of the Cape, was agitated during the year. Lord Knutsford replied to a delegation that waited upon him that it was not the intention of the Home Government at present to hand over the colony to the Cape, but yet he led the delegation to infer that at some future time this would be the destiny of the colony. He stated that there was the Crown colony of Bechuanaland, the protectorate, and the country within the sphere of British influence, and that while the Government would not interfere with the administration of the native Government, it should not allow Portuguese, German, or any foreign

nation or republic to settle down and annex the territory. It was not the desire of the natives to be handed over to any but the Imperial Government. The expenses of the colony were increased by the need of providing for a larger police force, and the necessary improvement of the permanent Government.

The British South African Company by the terms of its charter has authority in the protectorate of Bechuanaland, in Khama's country, and north to the Zambezi River, and west to twenty degrees east longitude, and in the whole of Matabeleland, the total area being between 360,000 and 400,000 square miles. The possession of this rich country abounding in resources will give the Company an immense influence in South African affairs. The country will be developed by the extension northwards of the railway and telegraph systems of the Cape in the direction of the Zambezi. A sum of 700,000*l.* had been already subscribed in October for proceeding at once with these works.

Zululand.—Since the supremacy of British rule has been effectively asserted in this country the condition of affairs has materially improved. The trial of the chiefs, Dinizulu, Undabuko, and Tshingana at Ekowe came to an end April 27, when they were all found guilty of high treason. Dinizulu, the son of Cetywayo, was sentenced to ten years imprisonment without hard labour, while his uncle, Undabuko, received sentence of fifteen years, and Tshingana twelve years. These sentences were deemed excessive, but the Government did not think it best to remit them. Dinizulu had indulged in a petty war with his hereditary enemy Usibepu, and when England supported Usibepu, Dinizulu found himself, by force of circumstances, rather than by deliberate intention, in conflict with the British Government. After his defeat he surrendered himself voluntarily. He was ably defended by European counsel, Mr. Escombe, who objected to the jurisdiction of the court, but was over-ruled. The evidence of the defence generally attributed the rebellion to Usibepu's restoration as ruler over a part of Zululand, and endeavoured to prove that he was attacked because the Usibus were displeased with his reinstatement. The alleged offences of Dinizulu were charged to the acts of officials and to the Queen's representatives.

Orange Free State.—A conference of delegates from Cape Colony, the Orange Free State, and Natal met in March at Bloemfontein, the capital of the Free State, to discuss the terms of the Customs Convention. The delegates of the Cape and the Orange Free State were in favour of the scheme of a Customs Union which was adopted by the Cape Town conference last year. The Natal delegates were opposed to this arrangement on account of the aversion of the people they represented to an increase of tariff, while the surplus revenue in the Treasury was fast accumulating. They therefore retired from the conference, with the understanding that Natal could come in later if she desired.

The delegates from Cape Colony and the Orange Free State then revised the Convention in accordance with their own interests irrespective of Natal, although the Natal delegates later rejoined the conference to discuss the railway question. Natal desired a low transit rate on inland commodities, leaving each State free to levy its own internal duties. The conference was closed in March, and both the Governments of Cape Colony and the Orange Free State having declined the proposals of Natal, endeavoured to give effect to the Convention as revised by their delegates, by legislative enactment. The Free State Volksraad, appointed a committee, including the President, to prepare a complete report as to the best means of securing immediate railway communication between Natal and Harrismith, the Natal Government expressing willingness to extend the line to the border, on conditions to be agreed upon, and also proposing to reduce *ad valorem* the customs duty to 5 per cent. in accordance with this proposal. The Natal Council passed the new tariff in June, empowering the Governor to reduce at discretion the duties on all articles going outside of Natal.

Transvaal, or South African Republic.—The marvellous development of the country through the discovery of the goldfields, and the consequent increase of population and wealth, has continued. The Boers control everything politically, although they number only 60,000 at most. They have the exclusive right of electing the Volksraad, which consists of forty-five members, and the President of the Republic is chosen by them by a direct vote. The new population, consisting of Germans, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen, with Englishmen forming the majority, number at least 100,000. The central gold-mining region is the Witwatersrand district, near Johannesburg, now a city of some 20,000 inhabitants. Gold is widely distributed throughout the Transvaal, and it is usually found in a conglomerate rock in the Witwatersrand mines, which has been called *bankét* (Dutch for almond rock.) To work the mines there has been required a vast quantity of machinery, and to move this heavy machinery railways are very much needed for some 300 miles, where everything has to be transported on bullock waggons along rough roads. President Kruger, whose preferences were for the completion of the Delagoa Bay railway, agreed in March with President Reitz of the Orange Free State to the extension of the railway from Bloemfontein to Pretoria in case the Delagoa Bay companies failed to settle their differences. The President opened the Volksraad in May, and announced the intention of the Government to modify the laws relating to gold, and to construct a railway between Pretoria and Johannesburg. The treaty of commercial union and defensive alliance concluded by Presidents Krüger and Reitz, by which either State will assist the other if war be justly declared, was considered to be not at all for the interest of the Orange Free State, which was not threatened by any war.

President Krüger announced in October that the railway tariff had been finally settled with Portugal, and that the Delagoa railway would be continued by the Netherlands company. Prolonged drought, preventing waggon transportation, produced a great scarcity of food in Johannesburg and Pretoria in October, and the President granted a remission of the duties on flour and eatables. The burghers were urged to employ their waggons in bringing food to Johannesburg, but the want of grass and the weak condition of their cattle made it difficult for them to come to the rescue. The Transvaal Government offered a bonus of 20*l.* to each of the first 250 waggons that should land food in Johannesburg.

The Transvaal revenue for 1888 was 884,440*l.*, which showed an increase of about 30 per cent. The expenditure was 770,492*l.*, and the available surplus 276,000*l.* The total revenue for 1889 was 1,972,799*l.* The expenditure amounted to 1,521,375*l.* The total balance was 626,424*l.* A large part of the revenue proceeded from gold mining.

The action of Portugal in the matter of the Delagoa Bay Railway was severely criticised. A concession was granted in Dec. 1883 to Colonel Edward M'Murdo for the construction of a railway from Lourenço Marques to the Transvaal frontier. The existence of gold in the Transvaal in such abundance was then unknown, and the commercial and agricultural interests of the country were in a very depressed condition. The construction of such a railway without a cash subvention appeared almost a hopeless task, and there can be no doubt that had the Portuguese Government been asked for it, it would readily have accompanied the concession with a money subvention. Colonel M'Murdo had a faith in the future of the Transvaal which events have since fully justified, but which was then shared by but few. Instead of asking for a cash subvention, he agreed to construct the line without any pecuniary assistance from the Portuguese Government, provided that, as a consideration, he received from that Government two guarantees, viz.:—(1) That the Government should allow no line of railway to be built in competition; and (2) That the company to be formed to carry out the concession should have the absolute and uncontrolled right to fix tariff rates. These demands were conceded by the Portuguese Government. But it was found impossible to obtain the necessary capital, in consequence of persistent rumours, emanating from Amsterdam, to the effect that in violation of the concession the Portuguese Government had made a promise to the Transvaal Government of a steam tramway, on the same course as the railway, to be used for the carriage of goods and passengers; and, in spite of the repeated denials of ministers at Lisbon, these rumours proved to be perfectly well founded, the secret arrangement between Portugal and the Transvaal being dated so far back as May, 1884. Mr. Knee, who was traffic manager of the railway as well as Acting Vice-Consul at Delagoa Bay, writing on June 29, stated

that the Portuguese Government had torn up the English railway; the head of the police had fired on an English driver on an engine; the English residents were being arrested without any provocation by anyone, and his interpreter had been arrested while interpreting a letter from the Government to Mr. Knee. A British gunboat was ordered to proceed to Delagoa Bay to protect the railway company. The original concession was obtained by an American citizen, the late Colonel M'Murdo, and the United States, since American citizens had property in the company, demanded full information from Portugal.

Lord Salisbury wrote to Mr. Petre, British Minister at Lisbon, on Sept. 10, expressing the views of Her Majesty's Government on the seizure of the Delagoa Bay Railway, and relying on the sense of justice of the Portuguese Government to repair the wrong done to the British company by the seizure of the line. Senhor Barros Gomes, the Portuguese Foreign Minister, in replying to this, on Nov. 13, contended that the Portuguese company, who were part owners of the line, still existed, and that they would treat with the English company in a court of arbitration. This despatch was forwarded to the British company by Lord Salisbury, and in commenting on it Mr. Horn, the secretary, writing on Dec. 15, said that the Portuguese company had ceased practically to exist, and pointed out that, if the Portuguese Government were in earnest in this matter a speedy settlement could not be but to their advantage, as the Netherlands company was commencing operations on its line, and any delay could only tend to make manifest the value of the property of which the company had been deprived. If, on the other hand, it was the object of the Portuguese Government by procrastination to weaken the financial position of the company, his directors felt that their interests were secure in his lordship's hands.

III. EAST AFRICA.

Abyssinia.—Italian annexation in Africa began in 1870 by the establishment of a coaling station at Assah on the Red Sea. In 1882 it was annexed. In 1885 Massowah was occupied by the Italians. Then small posts in the interior were taken, ostensibly to protect the trade routes. King John objected to all these advances, and looked with a jealous eye on the friendship between the Italians and Menelek of Shoa, who has since become the successful claimant to the Abyssinian throne. The crushing defeat of the Italians in the battle of Dogalis, January 1887, seemed to put an end to their hopes of obtaining a foothold in the country, but the death of King John in March, who fell by the hands of the dervishes at Metemneh, gave Menelek an opportunity to claim the throne. He proclaimed himself Negus, and informed King Humbert of Italy that he would send an envoy to him as soon as possible. The Negus Mangashah,

appointed by King John, was occupying Amhaia and a part of Tigré, and his rival claims to the throne account for the haste of Menelek to secure the support of some foreign Power. Italy, therefore, has become mistress of Abyssinia and all the neighbouring country, while in Somaliland she claims some 50,000 square miles in addition.

Zanzibar.—The proceedings of the German East African Company were causing serious loss to the Sultan Seyyid Khalifah early in the year, for the revenues of the coast line under the nominal jurisdiction of the company, and which were by contract to be paid into the Sultan's exchequer, were withheld. Since the beginning of the company's operations, the Sultan was said to have suffered a direct cash loss of 450,000 rupees, and a constructive loss ten times greater. Moreover, the Sultan had lost his power and prestige on the German coast line, because the officials and soldiers on the coast were left unpaid by the company, although it exacted 15,000 rupees per month from the Sultan to meet these payments. The blockade on the coast, nominally to suppress the slave trade, was a fruitful cause of arousing native animosity not only against the Germans but all Europeans. The German ships, steaming along the coast by night two miles from the shore, would occasionally throw shells at random on the land, merely in wantonness or to overawe the natives. Sometimes the shells would strike a native hut and kill all the occupants. The missionaries were put in great danger by such high-handed conduct of being murdered by the natives. Mr. Brooks, the Agent of the London Missionary Society, while returning from Lake Tanganyika to the coast, was murdered with sixteen of his followers by a mixed crowd of coast people and Zanzibar Arabs. He was killed simply because he was a white man and in revenge for German cruelty.

Bushiri, a half-breed, assembled on the coast in January about 6,000 men in rebellion against the Germans, and garrisoned Bagamoyo. The German Government, aware that something must be done to quiet these disturbances, appointed Captain Wissmann an Imperial Commissioner, whose work was to put down the insurrection and restore order in the German sphere of interest in East Africa. He was armed with full disciplinary and preventive powers over the officials of the German East African Company, without interfering with the internal affairs of the company or the administration of the Sultan's customs. Capt. Wissmann started for East Africa in February, accompanied by a number of officers.

The expedition of Dr. Carl Peters to find Emin Pasha set out from Germany also the same month. At Zanzibar it was joined by about 100 Somali soldiers, and 500 carriers taken from Zanzibar and along the coast. Dr. Peters arrived at Zanzibar April 19. He wished to land on the Somali coast, but the natives refused to allow him to do so, and threatened to kill

him if he did. Early in May he returned from Lamu, whither he had gone reconnoitring. The real aim of his enterprise was to establish connection between the German sphere of interest and Emin's equatorial province. News came in November that Dr. Peters and the whole of his party were massacred near Korkorro on the Tana river. This was regarded as doubtful for a long time, but at the close of the year there seemed to be every reason to believe the truth of the statement.

The troops under the command of Capt. Wissmann numbered about 1,000 men, 900 being Egyptians. Active hostilities were kept up in February between the Germans and the Arabs at Bagamoyo and Dar-es-Salaam, but without result, except to jeopardize the lives of missionaries in Arab hands. Bushiri established a large market in his camp, and many slaves were sold in defiance of all German interference. The pretence of putting down the slave trade by blockading 1,000 miles of coast, although the outlets for the traffic were so many in other directions, was still kept up. In March a bombardment of Saadani took place, but no lives were lost, as the people fled for safety. Some fighting went on at Bagamoyo, in which the Arabs were repulsed with considerable loss. The English missionaries arrived in safety at Bagamoyo from Mwapwa and Mamboya in April, Bushiri affording them protection.

The British East African Company had invariably received the loyal and active support of the Sultan, although he had an antipathy to Europeans generally. The management of the company was able and judicious, and in decided contrast to the German methods of intimidation.

A decisive engagement between the forces of Capt. Wissmann and the rebel chief Bushiri happened on May 8. Bushiri's camp was captured and destroyed, but he escaped, wandering from village to village, eluding the Germans trying to capture him. On June 7 the town of Saadani was again bombarded by the German ships, and a force of over 1,000 men was landed—Zulus, Europeans, blacks, and German sailors and marines. The town was set on fire, presumably by a shell, and the Arabs fled from their intrenchments and retreated into the interior. Captain Wissmann then endeavoured to make peace with the people of Pangani, but the immediate withdrawal of the German forces from Saadani was misinterpreted as a sign of weakness, and encouraged a party who were in favour of active opposition to the Germans, and so increased the difficulty of coming to an arrangement. All remnants of opposition disappeared from the neighbourhood of Bagamoyo, and Captain Wissmann invited British Indian traders to resume their ordinary peaceful avocations under his protection. They flocked to meet the caravan of ivory which arrived at the ruins of Saadani; other caravans were arriving at Pangani; and, as the question of Pangani was disposed of, everything pointed to a revival of trade.

Captain Wissmann declared it to be his policy to attack all Arabs who would not submit to his authority. On July 28 he offered a reward of 2,000 rupees for Bushiri's head. Bushiri mustered about 1,000 natives to renew hostilities in October, but no action took place till December, when he fought the Germans in the jungle where he had intrenched himself. A native tribe, induced by a reward of 10,000 rupees, captured him and surrendered him to the Germans. He was tried by court-martial, and executed December 15, at Pangani.

The Sultan protested against the continuance of the prohibition of the sale of arms in Zanzibar, and in return for his concessions respecting slavery he said that an end of the blockade had been promised, but excepting along the English coast line it was still continued.

Makulololand.—In October it was announced that Major Serpa Pinto, a Portuguese officer, had collected a force of Zulus and others, armed them with chassepôts and Martinis, and taken them up the Shiré to join another force which he had waiting on the south side of the Ruo, the limit of Portuguese dominion recognised by England. Mr. H. H. Johnston, the English Consul, had preceded him into the Shiré highlands a few months earlier, where the Makalolo accepted from him the protection of the British flag. Consul Johnston's despatch (August) says :—"He (Serpa Pinto) informed me first that he was conducting a scientific expedition into Nyassaland, and wished to pass through the Makalolo country ; but that the Makalolo chiefs had refused to let him pass. He wished me to reason with them and induce them to withdraw their opposition, otherwise there would be war. No chief in Africa had stopped him yet, and if the Makalolo resisted him the consequences to them would be serious, as his 731 armed men would make short work of their resistance. He was quite prepared for war, but he nevertheless would prefer a peaceful transit across their country on his way 'to that Portuguese subject Imponda,' and so on, with much reiteration and volubility. When able to reply I stated first that I felt sure that the Makalolo would never consent to the passage of such a large armed expedition through their country, as they disliked the Portuguese and suspected them of political designs upon their country. War between the Portuguese and the Makalolo would close the Shiré and seriously jeopardise the lives and property of British subjects in the Shiré highlands ; besides which, as it would arise from Portuguese aggression, it might have a serious effect on the relations between England and Portugal. I further reminded Major Serpa Pinto that his Government had distinctly assured ours that his mission was not to the Nyassa territories, but to the river Loangwa and Upper Zambezi. Major Pinto admitted that his original aim was the river Loangwa, but that owing to troubles and insurrections within the Makanga country he had thought of going to the

Loangwa by Lake Nyassa. 'Besides,' he added, 'I wish to make treaties along the upper part of the Loangwa and western Nyassa, and I may as well begin there and not lower down.' " Major Serpa Pinto proceeded to the Makalolo country, formed a large intrenched camp on the border, picked a quarrel with the natives, and having declared war, slew hundreds with Gatling guns. The Makalolo were in despair of help from the English, and were forced to accept the Portuguese rule for the time being. This happened near the close of the year, and up to that time no action was taken by the British Government to call the Portuguese to account.

IV. WEST AFRICA.

Sierra Leone, &c.—A conflict took place in February between a British expeditionary force and some natives of the West African coast. The town of Jeormah, occupied by natives friendly to the English, was attacked, and Captain Crawford thereupon proceeded up the Sulymah River to the relief of the place. No satisfactory reason was given for attacking Jeormah, and a fight took place in which 300 of the enemy were killed. The insurgents were commanded by the chief, Mackiah. A force of English troops under the command of Governor Hay afterwards captured and destroyed Largoh, the stronghold of this chief, and about 700 prisoners held by him were found there and liberated.

In May intelligence reached Freetown that the French had destroyed many towns and villages in the Samoo country on the borders of British jurisdiction to the north of Sierra Leone, and had actually destroyed villages within British territory. In March the French commandant at Benty had attempted to establish a custom-house within the territory of the Bey of the Samoo country, but was taken prisoner and handed over by the Bey's authority to the nearest British officer, who was stationed at Kaikonkeh. The arrest of this French commandant, who was soon afterwards released, furnished the plea for the revenge which has laid waste the Samoo country and driven the chief into exile. In December an encounter took place just outside the Sulymah district between a small British force and some warlike natives belonging to a district not included in the Protectorate. A Maxim gun soon routed the natives, and with no loss to the British, while 131 natives were killed.

Lagos. - The trade of Lagos in 1888 amounted to 357,831*l.* imports and 538,980*l.* exports. In 1861 it was made a British colony, but up to that time there had been no trade there except in slaves. Of the revenue about two-fifths is contributed by Abeokuta, a walled town with a population of 100,000. Some time ago this town was visited by a French official, who in the name of the French Government made a treaty with some of its

rulers. This caused considerable excitement in the colony, and a memorial was drawn up by the principal merchants, European and native, in Lagos, showing the loss to them which would follow the ratification of such a treaty. The Colonial Secretary, Lord Knutsford, stated in July that the French Government had no intention of acting upon the political clauses of the treaty. The French agents, however, on the West Coast are active, and cause apprehension among the British merchants.

The Congo.—The King of the Belgians, as sovereign of the Congo State, instituted in January an order called the African Star to reward services rendered in advancing civilisation in Africa. Eighty-five persons, including Mr. H. M. Stanley and Sir F. de Winton, received the decoration. The King also established the African Red Cross Association to give assistance to the wounded in African wars, and to wounded and sick explorers and scientific travellers.

By a decree of King Leopold elephant-hunting has been prohibited in the Congo State, excepting by special permission. Ivory abounds at Stanley Falls, and the Arab ivory traders, regarding the Congo route as more safe and economical than a caravan road through hostile countries, were forsaking the Zanzibar route.

The surveys for the proposed Congo railway were nearly completed at the beginning of the year. The director of the surveys, Captain Gambier, gave his statement in April that a capital of 1,000,000*l.* would be sufficient for the construction of the road, and also for the purchase of rolling stock, for general expenses, and for paying interest on the capital during the four years of construction. The road will be 260 miles long, extending from Matadi on the Lower Congo to Indolo on Stanley Pool.

The results of the ten years during which King Leopold has directed the affairs of the Congo have been summed up as follows by an officer of the State:—

“The Lower Congo has been opened up to navigation by large vessels as far as Boma, soundings have been made and the course marked out by buoys, a cadastral survey of the Lower Congo has been made as a step towards the preparation of a general map of the entire region, justice is regularly administered in the Lower Congo, and a trustworthy and cheap postal service has been established. In addition registries of births, deaths, and marriages have been established for the non-native population, and it is expected that soon the natives near the stations will also be brought within the scope of the Registrar's returns. At Banana, Boma, and Leopoldville medical establishments under the direction of Belgian doctors have been founded, and a considerable armed force of blacks, officered by Europeans, has been called into existence. The caravan route between Matadi and Leopoldville is as free from danger as a European road, and a complete service of portage by natives has been established.

A railway has been projected and the route almost entirely surveyed. The State has established herds of cattle at various stations, and in the very heart of Africa, on the waters of the Upper Congo, there is a fleet of steamers every year increasing in number. A loan of 150,000,000*f.* has been authorised, and the first issue subscribed. Many of the more intelligent natives from the country drained by the Upper Congo have taken service with the State, and numerous trading factories have been established as far up the river as Bangala and Louebo. In addition, several private companies have been formed for developing the country; and, finally, geographical discoveries of the greatest importance have been made, either by the officers of the State or by travellers, who received great assistance in their work from the State."

Niger Company.—The German Government appealed in November to the British Government to interfere respecting the action of the company in disregarding the observance of international treaties. Complaints were also made by the Germans that the Niger Company had not only "levied excessively high duties, but that these duties had been used to secure a monopoly for the Company of the most lucrative branches of trade or to render competition most difficult." Such manipulations were alleged to be in violation of the Company's charter. The report of the German commissioner to investigate the complaints of German subjects pointed out that the action of the Niger Company was inspired by a desire for monopoly, and in this course of action it did not allow itself to be checked either by the Niger Navigation Act or by the Anglo-German Convention of 1885, the provisions of which convention it has wilfully violated. Last year the Niger Company made a profit of about 40,000*l.*, if including the interest on the 250,000*l.* of Niger Government stock..

V. CENTRAL AFRICA.

Mr. Stanley and Emin Pasha.—After a journey full of peril and adventure, Mr. H. M. Stanley, having attained his object and brought away in safety Emin Pasha, arrived at Bagamoyo, on the Indian Ocean, December 6. He furnished an official report of his expedition, which gave an exhaustive account of what he and his followers endured and accomplished. He accepted the generous offer of the Congo route by the King of the Belgians, and the assistance of the steam flotilla of the Upper Congo. The expedition sailed (Feb. 25, 1887) from the port of Zanzibar, bound for Banana Point at the mouth of the Congo River. There were on board 800, including 11 English officers, some 600 Zanzibari, 62 Soudanese, 13 Somalis, and Tippoo Tib and his people, 97. On the 18th of the following month they arrived at Banana Point, and from thence were conveyed by steamers to the head of navigation of the Lower Congo.

Six days later they commenced the overland march to Stanley Pool, 235 miles, where they arrived April 21. By April 24, 63 men and 28 rifles had deserted. The steamers promised by King Leopold to convey them from Stanley Pool were not ready, and as the country was in a famished condition and unable to supply them with food, steamers belonging to the Baptist and the Livingstone Inland Missions were taken to transport the expedition up the Congo. On June 16, after a river voyage of 1,050 miles from Stanley Pool, they arrived at Yambuya. The boats were sent back to Stanley Pool, and a camp was formed, a broad ditch dug and fenced about with tall poles. Major Barttelot was appointed commander of the fort with Mr. J. S. Jameson second in command, while 80 armed men formed the garrison. By his letter of instructions the Major was expected to remain at Yambuya until the contingent of 131 men under Messrs. Ward and Bonny left at Bolobo down the river should arrive. He was then to organise the rear column and follow up the main body. Tippoo Tib, who had been left at Stanley Falls, said that nine days after arrival at his station he would set out with his 600 carriers for Yambuya camp to join in the march to Albert Nyanza. The advance column of 389 men, rank and file, set out from Yambuya on June 28 eastward through the continuous, unbroken, primæval forest. On the 160th day from Yambuya (Dec. 4) they emerged from the forest with only 173 men, rank and file. The sick were left at stations on the way; 33 men were left with an Arab named Kilonga-Longa. The men suffered terribly from ulcers, some from poisoned arrows or from anæmia caused by poor diet. They then entered upon a country exquisitely lovely and remarkably fertile and populous. As they approached the lake the natives were more and more determined to resist their advance; but on December 13 they sighted Lake Albert lying far below (2,900 ft.). From there they descended to the plain-like terrace that extends from the base of the plateau to the lake. From the natives they learned that there was no white man on the lake in their neighbourhood, and there was no trace of Emin Pasha. Mr. Stanley then determined to return to the forest region, select some clearing, build a fort, store the extra goods, and march back to the lake with the boat, by which he could easily communicate with Wadelai. Acting on this resolution they found an extensive clearing and built a fort which they called Fort Bodo. Lieut. Stairs was sent to Kilonga-Longa's for the boat. On the very day of his departure Mr. Stanley fell ill with "sub-acute gastritis," and a painful abscess developed in his left arm. On April 2, with Mr. Jephson and Surgeon Parke, he set out again. Captain Nelson remained in command of Fort Bodo. Returning to the densely populated district where they had so much trouble in making their way, they found the chiefs more friendly, and they entered into a confederation with them against the common enemy, the

Wanyoro. One day's march from the Nyanza they found letters from Emin, who had received information of their coming. Mr. Jephson manned the boat with a choice crew and set out northward to search for the Pasha. On May 1 they had the pleasure of seeing the *Khedive* steamer on the lake, and in the evening had the honour of welcoming Emin Pasha, Captain Casati, and a number of Egyptian officials at their camp near Nyamsassi. They stayed together till May 25, when Mr. Stanley set out for the second time to return westward to the forest region. They found neither Emin Pasha nor Captain Casati disposed to return to civilisation. They praised the land for its fertility and the agreeable climate; they loved the natives, and praised everything connected with life in that region. All they seemed to care for was means for defence against occasional or accidental disturbances. Early in June the advance column returned to Fort Bodo to proceed to the relief of Major Barttelot. No news arrived of the rear column, or of the volunteer couriers who left the fort March 16. Therefore, on June 16, they departed from Fort Bodo across the dreadful wilderness in search of them, leaving Lieut. Stairs, Captain Nelson, and Surgeon Parke behind with a garrison of 59 rifles.

In twenty-eight days they arrived at Ugarrowwa's station, which they found abandoned, and the slave trader and his hundreds of desperadoes had commenced the return home with - 600 tusks of ivory, which they had obtained by pillage and slaughter. Early in August Mr. Stanley's column overtook Ugarrowwa's immense caravan, with its flotilla of fifty-seven canoes, laden with helpless children, girls and young women; and his hoard of ivory, about fifteen tons, was near Wasp Rapids on the Ituri River. The surviving couriers were found with Ugarrowwa—three had been killed. On August 17 all that was left of the rear column was found within a palisaded village formerly belonging to the Bomalya tribe. Major Barttelot, they heard, had been shot by one of his own men on July 19. Mr. Jameson had gone to Stanley Falls for the eighth time to plead and bargain with Tippoo Tib for an Arab assistant to govern the unruly mob of Manyema carriers. Of the English officers only Mr. William Bonny remained, who told of the misfortunes that had overtaken Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson. On Aug. 12 Mr. Jameson commenced the descent of the Congo from Stanley Falls in a canoe. Five days later he arrived at Bomalya, sick of a pernicious fever, from which he died. The well-organised column of 270 was reduced to 102 meagre and starved men, and this was due in the first place to the breach of contract by Tippoo Tib and his method of prevarication and dissimulation. The young officers of the rear column were led to delay their march in the track of the advance column by Tippoo Tib's repeated promises of sending a contingent of porters. They (the porters) finally arrived eleven months after date, but meanwhile

the rear column had lost three-fourths of their number in camp from disease, anæmia, and manioc poison. In the second place Major Barttelot disregarded his letter of instructions, which provided against Tippoo Tib's perfidy. The return to the Albert Nyanza began on the last day of August, and Dec. 20 the expedition marched into Fort Bodo, where Emin Pasha and Mr. Jephson had promised to be by the middle of August. Nothing had been heard from them by Lieutenant Stairs. After three days' halt the whole expedition moved towards the Albert Lake, the fort was abandoned and burnt, and the enormous quantity of stores removed. They had given up all idea of escorting Emin Pasha and Captain Casati to the sea, believing that they loved the country too well to leave it. By the middle of January the expedition was within two days' march of the Albert Nyanza. They were welcomed by the people, who contributed grain, plantains, and small herds of cattle for their sustenance. One of the chiefs brought Mr. Stanley a packet of letters, by which he learned that Emin was a helpless prisoner in the hands of his own mutinous soldiers. Mr. Jephson was also a prisoner. They had been violently treated, and threatened with death. Plots had been laid also to entrap Stanley on his arrival at the lake. Mr. Jephson was not so strictly guarded as Emin, and he managed to get away and join Mr. Stanley within a few days in response to a letter sent him. From Mr. Jephson Mr. Stanley learned that Emin and Captain Casati were still undecided whether they would leave the country. A few days after the deposition of Emin as governor and his imprisonment, the Mahdists attacked the northernmost stations of the Pasha and captured them. This created a panic in the province. The Pasha's rebels, knowing that Mr. Stanley would soon appear with abundance of ammunition and guns, conceived the idea of capturing the expedition by a *coup*, and presenting it to the Khalifa at Khartoum. They informed the Mahdist general, Omar Sali, of their intentions. It was necessary for the rebels to produce Emin Pasha and Mr. Jephson before Mr. Stanley. Emin was not only to be set at liberty, but to be in the character of a reinstated governor, before Stanley's suspicions could be disarmed and their wiles could take effect. After a grand consultation at Wadelai the rebels deputed Selim Bey and twelve other superior officers to go to the Pasha and implore forgiveness for the past, and to offer to reinstate him. The Pasha was ready to condone their offences and to intercede for them with Mr. Stanley. Mr. Stanley meantime had learned the true state of affairs from Mr. Jephson, and was on his guard. The Pasha and officers were escorted to Stanley's camp; the rebel officers presented a document regretting their action in deposing the Pasha, and expressing profound loyalty to the Khedive of Egypt, the Government and Mr. Stanley, for all that had been done for their relief. They asked for a reasonable time to bring their

troops and families to the camp, which was granted them. Meanwhile Emin Pasha was to remain in the camp. Up to April 10 no sign appeared of the arrival of troops—about 1,500 regulars and 3,000 irregulars, with their families. The Egyptians in Stanley's camp were, however, in communication with the Egyptians and rebels at Wadelai. On April 10 the expedition set out for the south end of Lake Albert. Two days later Mr. Stanley was seized with a severe illness, from which his life was despaired of, but, through the skilful attention of Surgeon Parke, he recovered. The disaffected in Stanley's camp were disappearing with rifles, equipments and ammunition. Finally, a party of twenty disappeared, and volunteer detectives informed him that a larger demonstration would shortly follow. Although very ill in bed, he knew that there were 350 men in the camp on whom he could rely. A strong body of soldiers was sent off towards the lake, and secured a ringleader, with twelve of his band. By the blunder of a native chief a packet of letters addressed to the rebels at Wadelai fell into Stanley's hands; and, the Pasha opening them, the names of the rebels in the camp were discovered. A court was formed, consisting of the Egyptian officers in camp, and the ringleader was tried, was found guilty, and sentenced to be hanged.

On May 8 they resumed their march. As they advanced southward they entered the territory of Kabba Rega, where they were attacked by a band of soldiers of Wanyoro. The sharp defeat which they suffered cleared the country of the Warasmas as far as the Semliki River. Some skirmishes took place with the native tribes as the expedition advanced. From the Albert Nyanza to the south-western frontier of Karagwe they were supported by voluntary contributions of grain, bananas, and cattle. On Aug. 28 they arrived at Mr. Mackay's mission station at the south end of the Victoria Nyanza. From thence they took the road through Nera. The Wasakuma gathered in immense numbers, and for five days disputed every mile of advance through their territory, but the breechloaders subdued them at last. They then entered a friendly country, and thence to Mpwapwa progress was unmarked by either accident or notable incident. Numbers who were unable to reach the coast asked permission, to avail themselves of escort, until the expedition included nearly 1,000. They were escorted to Bagamoyo by Major Wissmann himself, who came out to meet them. The expedition was fortunate, besides effecting the rescue of Emin Pasha, in exploring about 1,200 miles of an unknown region, and in making several interesting discoveries. East and north, and north-east of the Congo, there exists an immense area of about 250,000 square miles of unbroken, compact, and veritable forest. The discovery of the source of the south-west branch of the White Nile was also made, and it was ascertained that the White Nile is formed by the surplus waters of two lakes, the Victoria

and the Albert Edward, which are received by the Albert and discharged northward by the White River. The exact limits of these great lakes were also discovered, as well as the snowy peaks called the Mountains of the Moon, which furnish the waters forming the Semliki River and the Albert Edward Lake.

CHAPTER VII.

AMERICA.

UNITED STATES—CANADA—CENTRAL AMERICA—WEST
INDIES—SOUTH AMERICA.

I. UNITED STATES.

THE state of political parties in the Congress of the United States at the beginning of the year 1889 (the closing session of the Fiftieth Congress) was as follows:—In the Senate: Republicans, 39; Democrats, 37. In the House of Representatives: Democrats, 165; Republicans, 152; Independents, 3; Fusionists, 2. John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, continued President *pro tempore* of the Senate, and John G. Carlisle of Kentucky, Speaker of the House of Representatives. President Cleveland's term of office did not expire till March 4. His Cabinet remained unchanged, and included Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware, Secretary of State; Charles S. Fairchild, of New York, Secretary of the Treasury; W. C. Endicott, of Massachusetts, Secretary of War; W. C. Whitney, of New York, Secretary of the Navy; W. F. Vilas of Wisconsin, Secretary of the Interior; Don M. Dickinson, of Michigan, Postmaster-General; and Augustus G. Garland, of Arkansas, Attorney-General.

Much legislation was attempted in the Fiftieth Congress, but comparatively little was accomplished. The bills and joint resolutions introduced during the Congress amounted to 12,927 originating in the House of Representatives, and 4,142 originating in the Senate. The most important acts which were passed during the second session, expiring March 4, were the following:—

An act creating an executive department to be known as the Department of Agriculture, the chief of which shall be Secretary of Agriculture.

An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

An act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States, and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, to form constitutions and State governments, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The last named act was signed by President Cleveland, Feb. 22, the anniversary of Washington's birthday. On the last day

of the session, President Cleveland vetoed a bill refunding certain direct taxes to the respective States that paid them during the Rebellion. The Senate passed the bill over his veto by forty-five to nine votes, but in the House of Representatives no vote was taken, and the bill was lost. Great numbers of people flocked to Washington to witness the inauguration of President Harrison on March 4. They came from all parts of the country, and many regiments of troops from neighbouring States were present. In spite of the drenching rains which marred the beauty of the pageant, the entire programme of ceremonies was carried out. The two Presidents were escorted by United States troops to the Senate chamber at the Capitol, where were assembled the Senators, the Judges of the Supreme Court, high officials of the army and navy, and the diplomatic corps. Mr. Ingalls, President *pro tempore* of the Senate, administered the oath of office to Vice-President Morton, and then the entire assemblage in the Senate proceeded to the east front of the capitol, where Chief Justice Fuller of the Supreme Court administered the oath to the incoming President, who then read his inaugural address to the vast throng of people standing below. Afterwards a grand procession escorted the President from the capitol to the White House. The ceremonies were closed by the Inauguration Ball at the Pension Building. The following day President Harrison sent to the Senate in Executive Session the list of his nominations for Cabinet officers. The appointments were at once confirmed by that body, and were as follows:—James G. Blaine, of Maine, Secretary of State; William Windom, of Minnesota, Secretary of the Treasury; Redfield Proctor, of Vermont, Secretary of War; Benjamin F. Tracy, of New York, Secretary of the Navy; John W. Noble, of Missouri, Secretary of the Interior; J. M. Rusk, of Wisconsin, Secretary of Agriculture; John Wanamaker, of Pennsylvania, Postmaster-General; W. H. H. Miller of Indiana, Attorney-General.

During the year, no less than ever, the country suffered from calamities that seemed to come from the act of God, but mainly resulted from the carelessness of men. One of the most appalling of these was the disaster in the Conemaugh Valley, Pennsylvania, which happened on May 31. An artificial lake, which was once a reservoir intended to supply the Pennsylvania Canal, was situated at the head of the Conemaugh Valley, 1,100 feet about the sea level; it was three miles long and three-quarters of a mile broad, and fed by mountain streams on all sides. One of the dams which penned in the lake gave way, and the water, rushing with terrific force into the Conemaugh river which runs between mountains 700 feet high, formed a gorge till it reached the open valley, when it spread out, carrying everything before it. Johnstown, a large and flourishing place, was swept away by the torrent. The Cambria Iron Works and Tanneries, employing 7,000 workmen, and other manufactories in the path of the flood,

were destroyed. From the official statement the number of bodies found and identified was 1,072; found and buried as unknown, 648; still missing, not found, 575. The lake had been for some years the property of several prominent Pittsburg men, who used it for shooting and fishing purposes. The water was very high on account of floods and rain storms at the time of the disaster, the earthworks restraining it were insufficient, and repairs had been neglected.

The President appointed in March three Commissioners, Messrs William Walter Phelps, John A. Kasson, and G. H. Bates, to attend a Conference at Berlin for the purpose of settling the Samoan dispute. The Conference was summoned by Prince Bismarck; it met on April 29, and was composed of German, English, and United States delegates. At the end of May they arrived at an agreement satisfactory to all the high contracting powers, and all American rights and interests in Samoa were fully conceded. Even the restoration of King Malletoa, who was friendly to the United States, and was imprisoned and exiled by the Germans, was granted. The treaty, however, was not ratified by the Senate before the close of the year.

The centenary celebration of the inauguration of General Washington as the first President of the United States took place in New York on April 30. A special thanksgiving service was held in St. Paul's Church, at 9 a.m., which was attended by President Harrison and other distinguished people—the Right Rev. Bishop Potter, of New York, officiating. Similar services were held at the same hour in all the churches of New York and throughout the country. The President, with his suite, afterwards proceeded to the Sub-Treasury building at the corner of Wall and Nassau Streets. It was within the portico of this building that the first President of the United States took the oath of office, April 30, 1789. Here a prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Richard S. Storrs, and then a poem was read by John G. Whittier, an oration delivered by Hon. C. M. Depew, of New York, and an address made by President Harrison. The orator, Mr. Depew, recounted the difficulties and dangers which beset the infant Republic, and the trials which came upon the founders of the Government. He regarded the ceremony of a hundred years before as the most unique event of modern times in the development of free institutions.

At the conclusion of the ceremonies the President and members of his cabinet, with other high officials of the Government, proceeded to Madison Square, where a great military review took place. Major-General Schofield was chief marshal, and the grand procession included the cadets of the Military Academy at West Point, the naval cadets from Annapolis, the troops of the regular army, the marines, the national guards from each State, arranged in the order in which the States ratified the constitution or were admitted to the Union. After these followed the military

order of the Loyal Legion and detachments of old soldiers forming the posts of the Grand Army of the Republic. In this display 50,000 persons took part. The weather was fine, and great enthusiasm was displayed by the dense crowds of spectators along the line of march.

The Supreme Court affirmed on May 13 the constitutionality of the Chinese Exclusion Act. The number of Chinese in New York City was increasing, and it was a problem with no apparent solution how they obtained an entrance into the country. It was finally ascertained that they were brought to the port of New York in considerable numbers as Spanish citizens from the Island of Cuba on vessels trading in fruit. Some made their way into the United States through Mexico, and large numbers were landed on the west coast of South America, from whence they crossed to Rio de Janeiro, and by vessels engaged in the fruit trade were brought to New York. This evasion of the law excluding the Chinese became a matter of investigation with the view of stopping any further immigration of celestials into the United States.

Negotiations were still pending for the settlement of the Behring Sea controversy, when an event occurred which threatened to terminate them abruptly. The British sealing schooner, *Black Diamond*, was captured by the United States revenue cutter, *Rush*, July 11, in Behring Sea. The schooner had taken fifty-three seals on that day and got them on board. When the *Rush* overtook her, she was ordered to heave-to, the chief officer of the revenue cutter came on board, and the papers of the British vessel were demanded. When they were refused, the Americans broke open the cabin and took the papers, and also 105 seal skins which had been captured in Behring Sea. The commander of the *Rush* put one seaman on board the *Black Diamond* as a prize crew, and she was ordered to sail to Sitka, Alaska. When the *Rush* disappeared, the schooner changed her course for Victoria, British Columbia, her home port, arriving there on August 3. The British schooners, *Minnie* and *Pathfinder*, with several hundreds of seal skins on board, were afterwards seized by the *Rush*. One man was put aboard each vessel, and they were ordered to sail to Sitka; but both, like the *Black Diamond*, proceeded to Victoria. These captures were regarded as mere trifling and not actual seizures. Captain Shepard, commanding the revenue steamer *Rush*, reported to the Treasury Department that he seized the *Black Diamond* for violation of section 1956 of the United States Revised Statutes, which was incorporated in President Harrison's proclamation (March 22). The President's proclamation concluded with the following words:—"Now therefore, I, Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States, pursuant to the above recited statute, hereby warn all persons against entering the waters of Behring Sea, within the dominion of the United States, for the purpose

of violating the provisions of said section, and I hereby proclaim that all persons found to be, or to have been, engaged in any violation of the laws of the United States in said waters will be arrested and punished as above provided, and that all vessels so employed, their vessels, apparel, furniture, and cargoes will be seized and forfeited."

The United States Government in 1868 prohibited the killing of fur-seals "within the limit of Alaska territory or the waters thereof." In 1889 one branch of Congress sought to define the waters of Alaska territory as embracing the whole of Behring Sea eastward of a line drawn midway between Atton and Copper Islands to Behring Strait. Afterwards, Congress struck out this definition and left the Act of 1868 in force, adding thereto the words—"dominion of the United States in the waters of Behring Sea." The limits of that dominion are left quite undefined. Secretary Manning, who was a member of President Cleveland's cabinet, assumed rather hastily that the dominion of the United States extended over Behring Sea, because the Russian Government had claimed it, and had disposed of this claim by the sale of all rights and privileges to the United States. International law, as expounded by Wheaton and other high authorities, maintained, however, that no nation could establish a claim to the sea beyond the "three mile limit." To protect the fur-seal and sea-otter from total extinction it seemed necessary that some restriction should be placed upon the capture of these animals in Behring Sea. At the Pribylov Islands, St. Paul and St. George, the take of seals is limited to 100,000 per annum, and these are all males, whereas in the open sea the sealing vessels capture the female seals in large numbers. It is not a hundred years ago that fur-seals existed in abundance along the coasts and islands of the southern ocean. They were to be found at Juan Fernandez, Chili, the Falkland Islands, South Georgia, South Shetland, Prince Edward Island, and many others. But their breeding places were not protected against the ruthless and indiscriminate slaughter of lawless sealers, and consequently they have been almost annihilated. At the close of the year, correspondence was still going on between the Governments interested in preserving the fur-seal fisheries in Behring Sea and its islands, with good prospect of a satisfactory arrangement.

The trial of the murderers of Dr. Philip P. H. Cronin at Chicago attracted much attention throughout the country for several months. The murder was done on May 4th. Dr. Cronin was a well-known physician of Chicago, prominent in Irish circles, and an active member of the Clan-na-Gael. He had been for some months engaged in a bitter controversy with the members of the Clan-na-Gael, charging certain prominent officers of the organisation with misappropriating the funds, and he was sustained in these charges by a large section of the Clan. His life had been threatened by his enemies in the society, and

he was preparing to present in detail his charges against the "Triangle," the so-called governing administration, which, as he alleged, had made an improper use of the money in their hands. Seven men were indicted for the murder—Martin Burke, John F. Beggs, Daniel Coughlin, Patrick O'Sullivan, Frank Woodruff, Patrick Cooney, and John Kuntze. Excepting Cooney, who was still at large, they were tried together. The coroner's jury had recommended that Alexander Sullivan, one of the "Triangle" which had previously governed the Clan-na-Gael, should be held for the action of the Grand Jury, but he was afterwards bailed for \$20,000, and was not indicted. The murder was accomplished in this manner:—

On May 4, late in the afternoon, there called in a great hurry at Dr. Cronin's lodgings in the Windsor Theatre Building, North Chicago, an unknown Irishman with a black beard, driving a buggy with a white horse. A few days previously Dr. Cronin had been requested by Patrick O'Sullivan, an ice-dealer in the northern suburbs, to attend any accident cases that might occur at his ice-house or to his people. This caller presented O'Sullivan's business card and said a patient had been badly hurt there, and the doctor was requested to hasten to his relief. Dr. Cronin picked up his medicine and instrument-case, and some cotton wadding such as is used in fractures, and quickly drove off in the white-horse buggy. This was the last seen of Dr. Cronin alive. After a day or two his disappearance was noised abroad, and the police authorities of North Chicago placed the case in charge of Daniel Coughlin, who was the chief detective of that district. Coughlin and his force declared they could find no traces of Dr. Cronin, and further reported that he had undoubtedly left Chicago, probably to go to England to testify before the Special Commission; that they had reason to believe he was one of the "British spies in America" mentioned by Le Caron; that he was fond of notoriety, and had adopted this mysterious method of concealment to produce a greater dramatic effect when he unexpectedly appeared as a witness in the court; and that he had cautioned the Conklins, with whom he lived, not to speak of his probable mission, or of his leaving Chicago, or to say anything indicating his whereabouts. These detective reports were at the time supported by plausible statements emanating from various places, all indicating his probable journey to England. A young lady of much prominence in Irish circles in Chicago stated positively that late on the evening of May 4 she was in a tramcar, and Dr. Cronin rode with her to the Union Railway Station, where he got out. She knew him well, and could not be mistaken. In St. Louis, Peoria, Kansas City, Omaha, New York, and other cities, statements were published, all tending to show that Dr. Cronin had left Chicago for England. At Toronto and Hamilton, in Ontario, reports were published that he had been seen and talked to, and was *en*

route eastward, though trying to conceal the fact. From all these cities for over two weeks these reports were diligently circulated, and finally, both in Chicago and throughout the country, there was a thorough belief created that Dr. Cronin had really left for England, that this was only a sort of theatrical disappearance, and that after a while he would reappear there. But suddenly came the news, three weeks after his disappearance, that Dr. Cronin's body had been most unexpectedly found in the catch-basin of a sewer on Ashland Avenue, a suburban street in Lake View, the northern Chicago suburb, and soon the body was thoroughly identified by hundreds, including his brother. The corpse, stripped stark naked, had been thrown head foremost and doubled up through the manhole of this catch-basin, not a particle of the clothing being anywhere about, although the *Agnus Dei* he always wore suspended around his neck was untouched. Some labourers repairing the roadway made the discovery, and a search in the neighbourhood elicited the fact that the body had been brought there in a waggon, and was packed in a trunk which had previously been found hidden in bushes in Lincoln Park, some distance away.

The theory of the law officers was that Daniel Coughlin had charge of the work and employed the others, he and they being members of Camp 20 of the Clan-na-Gael; that Burke and Cooney did the actual murder, with Coughlin in the cottage at the time or shortly afterwards; that Beggs and Coughlin managed the Clan-na-Gael trial which ordered the "removal" of Dr. Cronin, and that O'Sullivan, Woodruff, and Kuntze were accessories. Many weeks were spent in selecting the jury, and 1,115 talesmen were examined. Before the trial came on Martin Burke fled to Manitoba, but his extradition was accomplished after much difficulty, and he was brought to Chicago and put on his trial with the others. The trial ended on December 16, in the conviction of Burke, Coughlin, and O'Sullivan, who were sentenced to imprisonment for life, and of Kuntze, who was sentenced to three years imprisonment; Beggs was acquitted, and Woodruff also, against whom nothing could be proved. They would all have been hanged but for the action of one juror.

Several persons were arrested for attempting to bribe the jury, among whom was a clerk of Alexander Sullivan's legal adviser.

In response to a joint resolution of the United States Congress, a Conference of representatives of all the nations on the American continent met at Washington, October 2, to consider measures for promoting international commerce. This was a favourite scheme of Mr. Blaine when he was Secretary of State in Garfield's Cabinet eight years before, but the assassination of the President prevented its realisation. The Conference or Congress was organised with Secretary Blaine as president, and the following day the delegates began a series of excursions which

finally extended over the whole country, having for their object the study of the various industries and institutions of the United States. Among the subjects for consideration before the Congress were the improvement of international communication by ship and rail; a customs union, or other equitable tariff arrangement; a continental system of weights and measures; a continental uniform monetary arrangement; and an international court of arbitration.

The Conference lasted till the end of the year, and in December both Houses of Congress passed bills extending its duration until March 1, 1890.

Another Conference, which included representatives from twenty-three of the commercial nations of the world, including China and Japan, met at Washington October 16, to discuss the necessity of "an unspoken language," universal to maritime nations, by which the dangers of the sea might be diminished. The questions proposed included the use of marine signals, the means of saving life and property from shipwreck, warnings of approaching storms, regulations to determine sea-worthiness, and the establishment of a permanent International Marine Commission.

In August the warlike Sioux Indians, after a long parley with the Commission appointed to treat with them, signed an agreement for the sale of a part of their reservation in Dakota Territory to the United States Government. Eleven millions of acres were sold for fourteen millions of dollars, and the land was offered for purchase to settlers. The liberal grants of alternate sections of land by the Government to the Pacific and other railways rapidly diminished the public domain in former years, so that now the Government has comparatively but little land for disposal. The purchase of the Dakota reservation was followed, November 3, by the President's proclamation declaring North Dakota and South Dakota States of the Union. On November 8 a similar proclamation opened the door for the entrance of Montana, and on the 11th the State of Washington was the subject of another proclamation. At the elections held in October, the Republicans were successful in North Dakota and South Dakota, while the Democrats claimed to have carried Montana. A Republican was elected as Member of Congress, but there was no election of Senator from Montana at the opening of the fifty-first Congress. The new State of Washington elected two Republican Senators, and a Republican Member of the House of Representatives.

To prevent fraudulent voting at elections, several of the States—Indiana, Montana, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Minnesota, Missouri, Michigan, and Connecticut, following the example of Massachusetts—adopted what was termed the Australian ballot system, which is much the same as that in use in England. By this plan the balloting was made entirely secret, and interposed the most effectual barrier to the bribery of the

voter. In certain Southern States where the coloured voters outnumber the whites, this system was not yet adopted in 1889. If coloured men who have the right of suffrage could vote without fear of intimidation in the South, the results would not probably be so uniformly favourable to the Democratic party. Several serious outbreaks occurred during the year between the whites and blacks in the Southern States, and one of the most difficult problems for American statesmen to solve was, "What shall be done with the black race, and how shall a conflict of races be prevented?" The negroes at the South are increasing much more rapidly than the whites, and this fact was causing considerable anxiety and alarm to statesmen of all parties.

An Act to provide for taking the eleventh census of the United States was approved by President Cleveland, March 1, 1889. It provided that the census of the population, industry, and wealth of the country should be taken June 1, 1890, and for the purposes of enumeration the whole country was divided into 175 districts.

The exports of the United States for the year ending June 30 amounted to \$742,401,799; while the average for the four years preceding was \$708,516,087. In 1880–81 the exports were greater than in any other year, amounting to \$902,377,346. The decline in the export trade is principally in breadstuffs. The total value of exports of provisions and dairy products was \$104,000,000. The export of cotton amounted to \$237,756,732, and of petroleum to \$49,871,532. The imports amounted to \$745,127,476, the largest ever made. By the figures of the previous five years, the import trade of the country was steadily increasing; the imports and exports nearly balancing. During the last two years the imports for the first time exceeded the exports. Heretofore the balance has always been very much the other way. In 1878–79 the exports exceeded the imports by \$264,661,666. The wheat crop was slightly less than in 1880, 1882, and 1884; while the cotton crop exceeded, according to trustworthy estimates, the yield of any former year by 200,000 or 300,000 bales. Manufacturers were generally prosperous, while the cost of commodities was considerably cheapened to the consumer. The volume of currency was slightly increased during the year.

"Trusts," or combinations to secure a monopoly, were not as a rule successful. In several of the States laws were passed to repress these syndicates, disturbing to trade and industry and the general weal. The labour organisations were engaged in numerous strikes, especially in the early part of the year, and some of the coal strikes were prolonged, and attended with violence.

Among the appointments made by President Harrison as Ministers and envoys to foreign Powers were, Robert T. Lincoln of Illinois, Minister to Great Britain; Whitelaw Reid of New York, Minister to France; F. D. Grant of New York, Minister to Austria; and William Walter Phelps of New York, Minister to

The first session of the fifty-first Congress began on December 4. The state of parties was then as follows:—In the Senate—Republicans, 45; Democrats, 37—with 2 vacancies. In the House of Representatives—Republicans, 168; Democrats, 161—Levi P. Morton of New York being Vice-President, and President of the Senate; and in the House of Representatives, Thomas B. Reed of Maine was elected Speaker by a Republican majority. On the following day President Harrison sent his first annual Message to each House. It began by stating that few international questions were left unadjusted. Referring to the Pan-American Congress, the President expressed the hope that it would result in improved commercial facilities and better securities for the maintenance of peace on the American Continent. He trusted that the Samoan Treaty would be productive of permanent law and order in Samoa on the basis of the maintenance of the rights and interests of the natives as well as of the Treaty Powers. The questions which had arisen during the past few years between Great Britain and the United States were now in abeyance or being amicably adjusted. Canada had administered the Fisheries during the past season with little friction, and he trusted that all existing causes of difference on this subject between the United States and Canada would soon be equitably adjusted.

The President next recommended increasing the number of extraditable offences between Great Britain and the United States, and announced that a new treaty dealing with the question would soon be submitted to the Senate. The adjustment of the claims of the United States against Spain was not being effected so rapidly as could be desired. Alluding to the beginning of the Nicaraguan Canal, the President said:—"This Government is ready to promote every proper requirement for the adjustment of all questions presenting obstacles to its completion."

The Message next expressed interest in the Anti-Slavery Congress in Brussels, and, continuing, stated that most cordial relations exist between the United States and Germany, and that the naturalisation questions with the latter country are considered settled to the mutual satisfaction of both. Similar questions with France, Italy, Russia, Turkey, and Switzerland continued to arise. The improper use of naturalisation was disapproved, but all duly-naturalised persons should everywhere be accorded the rights of adopted citizenship. The President, at the same time, recommended special conventions to settle such questions.

Referring next to Brazil, he said:—"Our friendly intercourse is interrupted, but our Minister is instructed to formally and cordially recognise the Republic when the majority of the people signify their assent to it."

Turning to finance, the President announced that the receipts in the last fiscal year amounted to \$387,000,000, of which sum

\$224,000,000 were derived from the Customs. The expenditure, including the Sinking Fund, amounted to \$329,579,929, leaving a surplus of \$57,000,000. The revenues of the current year were estimated at \$385,000,000, and the expenditure with the Sinking Fund at \$341,000,000, showing an excess of \$44,000,000. After stating that similar estimates are prepared for the fiscal year ending in 1891, the President continued:—

“So large a surplus demands the immediate attention of Congress with a view to reducing the receipts as closely as possible to the needs of the Government. The presence of such a surplus is a disturbing element in business. The revenue should not be collected for the purpose of anticipating bonds, but any unappropriated surplus should be so used.”

The President proceeded to condemn the loaning of public funds to banks without interest. The deposits now out should be gradually withdrawn and applied to the purchase of bonds. He recommended the revision of the tariff, both the administrative features and the schedules, with a uniform valuation at all ports, and declared it to be essential that effective measures should be taken to secure it. It was equally desirable, the Message continued, that the questions affecting the rates and classifications should be promptly decided. The preparation of new schedules being a delicate and difficult matter, the changes should be made so as not to impair the just and reasonable protection of home industries. Inequalities should be adjusted, but the protective principle maintained and fairly applied to the products of farms and shops.

The free list could safely be extended by adding to it articles not injuriously competing with domestic products. The President also recommended the removal of the excise on tobacco, and, if fraud could be avoided, also on spirits used for arts and manufactures. He disapproved, however, of any considerable increase in the rate of coining standard silver dollars, and pointed out that while favourable conditions have contributed to maintain a practical equality of the gold and silver dollar, some of these are trade conditions, which statutory enactments do not control, and of the continuance of which one cannot be certain. Safe legislation in respect to this subject must secure the equality of the two coins in commercial uses. Secretary Windom's plan for the issue of notes upon deposit of silver bullion at the market value the President declared worthy of careful consideration.

Mr. Harrison favoured an improvement in the coast defences, restrictive legislation in reference to trusts and international copyright, and less facile naturalisation of Socialist immigrants. A further increase in the navy was also recommended, as well as the passage of a Dependent Pension Bill. The terms of this measure as recommended by the President are nearly similar to those of the Bill for the same purpose which was vetoed by Mr. Cleveland during his Presidency. The Message reiterated the

President's devotion to Civil Service law, and favoured national aid to education. It lamented that the negroes in some sections had been deprived of their political rights, and recommended that legislation should be made to protect them more fully in this respect. He deplored the inferiority of the merchant marine, and favoured liberal ocean mail appropriations for American steamers to Central and South America, China, Japan, and the more important islands, with a view to encourage the establishment and equalise the chances of the American lines.

The President also favoured a national reserve of merchant vessels similar to that of England. He concluded with expressing the view that, while economy in respect to the national expenditure was praiseworthy, a liberal and progressive policy should be adopted in the promotion of foreign commerce.

The Secretary of the Treasury sent to the House of Representatives his annual report, which was a long and exhaustive document. His statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1889, was as follows :—

REVENUES.

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| From Customs | \$223,832,741-69 |
| From internal revenue | 130,881,513-92 |
| From profits on coinage, bullion deposits, and assays | 10,165,264-79 |
| From sales of public lands | 8,038,651-79 |
| From fees—consular, letter patent, and land | 3,378,063-59 |
| From tax on National banks | 1,536,087-16 |
| From sinking fund for Pacific railways | 1,321,124-53 |
| From customs fees, fines, penalties, and forfeitures | 1,118,020-78 |
| From repayment of interest by Pacific railways | 603,764-72 |
| From Soldiers' Home permanent fund | 592,427-25 |
| From sales of Indian lands | 446,258-19 |
| From tax on seal-skins | 317,500-00 |
| From sales of Government property | 295,530-42 |
| From immigrant fund | 280,196-50 |
| From deposits for surveying public lands | 95,618-63 |
| From depredations on public lands | 65,434-29 |
| From sale of condemned naval vessels | 22,582-75 |
| From revenues of the district of Columbia | 2,523,950-69 |
| From miscellaneous sources | 1,524,127-15 |
| Total ordinary receipts | <u>\$387,050,068 84</u> |

EXPENDITURES.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| For civil expenses | \$25,566,131-05 |
| For foreign intercourse | 1,897,625-72 |
| For Indian service | 6,892,207-78 |
| For pensions | 87,624,779 11 |
| For the military establishment, including rivers and harbours and arsenals | 44,435,270-85 |
| For the naval establishment, including vessels, machinery, and improvements at navy yards | 21,378,809-81 |
| For miscellaneous expenditures, including public buildings, lighthouses, and collecting the revenues | 47,951,637-57 |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| For expenditures on account of the District of Columbia | 5,248,669 92 |
| For interest on the public debt | 41,001,484-29 |
| Total ordinary expenditures | <u>\$281,996,615-60</u> |
| Leaving a surplus of | <u>\$105,053,443-24</u> |
| Of which there was used in the redemption of notes and fractional currency, and purchase of bonds for the sinking fund, the sum of | 47,583,313-65 |
| Leaving a net surplus for the year of | <u><u>\$57,470,129-59</u></u> |

The surplus for the next fiscal year the Secretary estimated at \$92,728,505-30, and the annual surplus over sinking fund requirements at nearly forty-four millions of dollars. He elaborately discussed the silver question, and said that the continued coinage of the silver dollar was the disturbing element in the otherwise excellent financial condition of the country, and a positive hindrance to any international agreement, looking to the free coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio. The Treasury vainly tried to get silver dollars into circulation, and the Secretary thought their further coinage and storage a waste of public money. He suggested, as a measure to remedy the difficulties, the issue of Treasury notes against deposits of silver bullion at the market price of silver at the time when deposited, payable on demand in such quantities of silver bullion as will equal in value, at the date of presentation, the number of dollars expressed on the face of the notes, at the market price of silver, or in gold at Government option, or in silver dollars at the holder's option. He also proposed to repeal the compulsory feature of the present Coinage Act.

The total debt of the United States, December 1, 1889, was \$1,617,372,419-85.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report, asked of Congress \$97,210,252 to make a "legal and liberal" payment to pensioners during the next fiscal year. The last fiscal year's outlay for pensions was \$88,000,000, which was an increase of more than \$9,000,000 over that of the preceding year. Since the civil war the people of the United States have paid one billion of dollars in pensions, and this expense has increased immoderately during the past five years.

The Secretary of the Navy brought forward a scheme of naval construction involving the building and completion by the close of the year 1903 of ten battleships, each of 8,000 tons, and costing in all \$50,000,000; eight battleships, each of 8,000 tons, costing in all \$40,000,000; twelve battleships, each of 7,000 tons, costing in all \$54,000,000; five battleships, each of 6,000 tons, costing in all \$17,500,000; ten armoured rams, each of 3,500 tons, costing in all \$18,000,000; nine belted cruisers, each of 6,250 tons, costing in all \$29,700,000; four deck-protected cruisers, each of 7,400 tons, and costing in all \$14,000,000; nine deck-protected cruisers, each of 5,400 tons, costing in all

\$25,200,000; two deck-protected cruisers, each of 4,000 tons, and costing in all \$4,100,000; five despatch vessels, each of 1,200 tons, costing in all \$2,500,000; three depôt ships, each of 4,500 tons, costing in all \$6,000,000; and fifteen torpedo gunboats, each of 900 tons, and costing in all \$7,500,000. Total number of ships, 92; total tonnage, 488,450; and the total estimated expense, \$268,500,000. Congress may determine to deplete the overflowing Treasury by this method.

II. CANADA.

Nothing serious happened to disturb the prosperity of Canada during the year 1889.

The harvests were good, and the country made satisfactory progress. All the talk of annexation to the United States produced no tangible results, and the people were evidently unprepared for separation from the Imperial Government.

Great indignation was expressed at Ottawa at the outrage in Behring Sea, which resulted in the capture of several sealers from British Columbia by the United States revenue cutter *Richard Rush*, and a meeting was held there (July 30) to protest against the seizures. A meeting of the Cabinet was called to discuss the affair, but no definite action was taken. A deputation also waited on Provincial-Secretary Robeson, who telegraphed to Ottawa demanding protection from the Imperial Government for the British sealers in Behring Sea.

Early in the year there was some agitation for a commercial union with the United States. The House of Representatives at Washington, Dominion of Canada, passed the following joint resolution, which was supported by a strong report from their Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"Whenever it is duly certified to the President that the Government of Canada has declared a desire to establish a commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal revenue taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three Commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and the equitable division of receipts in the commercial union; and the said Commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

The Inter-State Commerce Committee of the United States Senate, sitting at Chicago in July, received from the Chicago Board of Trade answers to certain questions concerning the effect of the Canadian transportation lines upon commercial

These answers were that the Canadian lines affect commerce favourably, by opening as many channels of trade as possible, and by equalising freights in cases where the American lines charge exorbitant rates; that no further restrictions upon commerce between the United States and Canada should be tolerated; and that nothing should be done to take away the facilities for transportation now enjoyed by all.

In the Canadian House of Commons, March 1, Mr. Laurier made a motion to continue in force the *modus vivendi* under the Fisheries Treaty for another year, which was defeated by 108 votes to 65; and in October the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declared that the Dominion Government had arrived at no conclusion as to the renewal of licences to United States fishing-vessels for the next season in accordance with the *modus vivendi*. With respect to the whole question of trade and commercial relations with the United States the Dominion Cabinet was not in harmony. Sir John Thompson, the Minister of Justice, made a public statement in October at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, in which he said, "Reciprocity is unnecessary, impossible, and is not the policy of the Conservative party." Speaking for the Government, he said, "We fully intend to adhere to our present policy, and will not attempt any reciprocity measure or proposal until the United States take the matter in hand." This announcement caused considerable surprise, and comment was freely made upon it by the Conservative as well as the Liberal press. It was stated, however, that Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, repudiated the responsibility of the explanation of the Government policy as given by the Minister of Justice.

The United States Senate Committee on Relations with Canada held a sitting in New York (Dec. 30), and among the witnesses examined was Erastus Wiman, a native Canadian, resident in the United States, who said that, having an intimate acquaintance with the subject, he felt competent to speak concerning the present relations between Canada and the United States, which he declared were very unsatisfactory.

On March 6 the Finance Minister presented his Budget to Parliament. He estimated the receipts of the current fiscal year at \$38,500,000, and the expenses at \$36,600,000; the surplus being \$1,900,000. For the next year he estimated the revenue at \$39,179,000. The net debt amounted to \$234,531,358.

The Canadian Governor-General, Lord Stanley of Preston, made a tour in September through the North-West Provinces, and was cordially received at Winnipeg, where he was entertained at a banquet on the 25th, given in his honour by the Manitoba Club.

Important arrangements were made both by the Imperial and the Canadian Governments for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A contract was finally signed for the establishment of

a line of fast steamers across the Pacific, to sail monthly between British Columbia and China and Japan. The subsidy in aid of the service was to be 60,000*l.* per annum ; 45,000*l.* provided by the Home Government, and 15,000*l.* by the Government of Canada. The new ships were to be constructed to meet Admiralty requirements. On the Atlantic also provision was made for a fast line in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Early in July it was announced that the managers of the Orient Line to Australia had entered into a contract with the Canadian Government for a weekly service of express steamers between England and Canada ; the subsidy to be 100,000*l.* a year, and the steamers to be guaranteed to make the voyage within six days. A year would elapse before the ships would be ready to begin this service.

III. CENTRAL AMERICA.

Panama Canal.—An extraordinary general meeting of the shareholders of the Panama Canal Company was convened in Paris on January 26. M. de Lesseps opened the proceedings, and said that to render them valid half of the capital, or 800,000 shares, should be represented at the meeting. As only 137,269 shares were represented, there could be no action. Under the circumstances, however, he allowed the provisional administrators to read their report. M. de Lesseps said that in order to secure the completion of the canal he had founded a new company to take the place of the present one, legally dissolved. It was proposed to dispense with the two upper locks, and thereby open a freer passage to navigation. The capital of the new company would be 450,000,000 francs. Resolutions were unanimously adopted to continue the works to February 15 ; to hand over the assets of the old company to the new one ; and M. Brunet, an advocate and former Minister, was chosen as liquidator. On February 9 M. de Lesseps addressed a letter to the subscribers of the new Panama Company, informing them that since the law requiring the deposit of a quarter of the share capital had not been complied with he was not in a position to constitute the new company, and that it would now be necessary to leave to the liquidator selected the care of their interests and the destiny of the work, which must be completed.

Large numbers of workmen were discharged from the canal works in February. In all the sections the contractors were curtailing labour, and a total suspension was expected in a short time. The United States Senate returned the Sundry Civil Bill to the House of Representatives with an amendment appropriating \$250,000, to be expended by the President in protecting American interests on the Isthmus of Panama, and a resolution was passed protesting against French control of the canal. No progress was made during the summer in floating the new com-

pany. In October, at the drawing of Panama bonds, M. Brunet said that he was anxious to find a company which would complete the canal and take over the plant, and that he had appointed an inquiry commission of independent and conscientious men to satisfy a substantial company which he hoped to form. Among the fifteen men constituting the commission were an Englishman, a Dutchman, and a Belgian; the rest were Frenchmen. Five members were to go to Panama and make a thorough report on the works, and on the best way of completing the canal in the time required. A renewal of the concession, which would expire in three years, and would not be renewed unless the works were in an advanced state, was also to be obtained. If the capital for the undertaking could not be found in France, M. Brunet said that he should have to look elsewhere. He begged the shareholders and bondholders to be patient for a few months.

Nicaragua.—While the great undertaking of M. de Lesseps languished, some progress was made with the scheme for a ship canal by the Nicaragua route. An Act was passed by the Congress of the United States, Feb. 7, and approved by President Cleveland, incorporating the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua. Although longer than the Panama route, the Nicaragua Canal has fewer natural obstacles to overcome, and can be completed at much less expense. A breakwater is to be constructed at Greytown on the Carribean Sea, and there will be necessary the building of several expensive locks, with the water raised by dams and embankments. The total length of the canal from ocean to ocean is 170 miles, but there will be free navigation through Lake Nicaragua, fifty-six miles, and in the San Juan River for sixty-four miles. The time from ocean to ocean, it is estimated, will be twenty-eight hours, and the estimated cost is counted at \$50,000,000. The Panama Canal would cost, if completed, \$1,000,000,000, and the receipts from tolls would not amount to more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum on the enormous capital expended. Some dispute arose with Costa Rica whether the Nicaragua Canal should go on the Costa Rica side of the San Juan River, and the Nicaragua authorities came to the conclusion that it would be best to run the canal wholly through Nicaraguan territory. This disagreement was causing some danger of war between the two States. Although Nicaragua was the largest country, the military strength of Costa Rica was about equal to her own. Five years would be required, it was thought, to complete the canal, and work upon it was expected to begin early in 1890.

Central American Confederacy.—A confederacy of the States of Central America, viz. Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and San Salvador, was arranged to go into effect Sept. 15, 1890, if approved by a majority of the five Republics. The union was to be formed if three of the States favoured it, and was to continue for ten years, each State having

its own President and Congress. It was proposed that at the expiration of the ten years, if the plan worked well, a closer union should be formed, with one President and one Congress for the entire country.

IV. WEST INDIES.

Cuba.—The arrival in March of General Salamanca, one of the most prominent men in Spain, as the new Captain-General, was welcome to all classes, and especially to native Cubans, who complained that none of them were chosen for responsible employment in the island. General Salamanca was liberal in his views, and ready to recognise the claims of citizens, and was sent to redress existing abuses.

Much kidnapping by well-organised bands of brigands was going on in the island. The planters and rich capitalists were being carried off and held for ransom by these lawless bands, and one of the tasks undertaken by the Captain-General was to put a stop to these outrages. The condition of the island was nevertheless improving. The sugar crop was lessened somewhat because of the heavy cyclone which swept over Cuba at the close of the preceding year, and sugar plantations were in the market, and could be bought very cheaply. Sponge-fishing was a growing trade. Extensive iron mines were about to be opened in the Cuban mountains. About twenty miles west of Santiago, near the coast, lies the iron-ore region of a new American company—the second mine in operation in the island. Another mine is worked by the Pennsylvania and Bessemer Steel Company.

The extension of the Western Railway of Cuba was projected, and tenders for the work were proposed by the Spanish Government early in the year.

Hayti.—The long struggle between the rival Presidents in the black republic of Hayti ended with the triumph of General Hippolyte. In February several battles took place, and at one time President Légitime's fortunes seemed to be in the ascendent, as he had gained important victories over his rival. But in August, General Légitime surrendered Port au Prince, the capital, to the forces of General Hippolyte, and escaped to France. The victor declared himself the "Provisional President," until one could be regularly elected. The election took place on Oct. 14, when Hippolyte received the votes of all the ninety-one delegates.

Previous to the election, the delegates were employed in revising the Constitution. Several plans were proposed, but the one chosen was modelled after that of the United States, which provided for a legislature consisting of an Upper and a Lower House, with the Presidential election occurring once in four years instead of seven years as heretofore. The appointment of Frederic Douglass, a mulatto, as Minister of the United States to Hayti did not give unmixed satisfaction, the full-blooded

Haytian preferring white Ministers such as are given to other nations. Affairs in the island were resuming their normal condition at the close of the year, and business was more active than it had been for a long time.

Jamaica.—Much regret was expressed at the departure of Sir Henry W. Norman, the Colonial Governor, who had secured the full confidence and affection of the people, and had done very much during his administration to advance the interests of the colony. His successor, Sir Henry Blake, entered upon his term of office with bright prospects of becoming equally popular. Education showed great progress, both in the number of schools and the number of pupils. A remarkable increase in trade, as shown by the exports and imports, took place during the year. The imports were valued at 1,695,605*l.*, and the exports at 1,828,590*l.*; each an improvement on the best of the nine preceding years. The exports of coffee, fruits, ginger, and cocoa considerably increased, while sugar decreased. The trade of the colony with the United States was growing, although decreasing with the United Kingdom. The year started with a deficit, but the revenue covered both the deficit and expenditure, leaving a surplus of 30,000*l.* One half of the revenue is derived from import duties. The colonial debt went on increasing, and was over 1,500,000*l.*, half of it being railway debt. In Turk's and Caicos Islands, dependencies of the colony, there was not the same prosperity, owing to a protracted drought, followed by a disastrous hurricane, which brought widespread suffering to the poorer classes.

Many of the immigrants renewed their contracts after the expiration of their terms of service. A new steamship company, engaged in the fruit trade, with vessels running around the island, touching at Tobago, and thence direct to New York, was established, and some progress was made in extending the railway system to connect Port of Spain, the capital, with the fertile districts of the interior.

V. SOUTH AMERICA.

Argentine Republic.—In the budget for 1890, which was sent to Congress July 20, the ordinary expenses of the Government were estimated at \$55,473,762; showing an increase above those of the current year of \$6,709,592. The public revenue was estimated at \$57,380,000. It must be remembered, however, that these budget figures are paper and not gold values, as gold was above 70 per cent. premium in July, and the value of the paper currency continued to depreciate. The Minister of Finance made some absurd attempts to lower the premium on gold, first by declaring that no premium beyond a certain one should be legal. This only had the effect of running up the premium still higher. He then closed the Stock Exchange and put the Fire Department on guard at the doors, so that there should be no more speculation in gold. But this master-stroke of policy ran the premium up to such an alarming figure that the poor Finance Minister was compelled to withdraw his guard and leave the speculators to do as they liked, whereupon the premium subsided to what it had been before his interference.

While the Republic never seemed more prosperous, and the signs of wealth and comfort never more general, this prosperity was confined to very few. For the working-classes and those with fixed incomes the cost of living had risen enormously. Meanwhile the revenue never was so large, and the Treasury was glutted with millions. The crops for the year were estimated to be worth from fifteen to twenty millions sterling, and the harvests were so great that labourers could not be found to gather them. A proposition was laid before Congress to devote five millions of acres of the public lands in the far south territory of Chabut to homestead farms for Argentine and European families at the minimum price of \$1 an acre, and the maximum of \$3 per hectare, payable in ten years. No finer land can be found in the Republic, and this measure was regarded as of great importance to the future of the country. The immigration returns in October were 28,000—the largest ever published; but there appeared to be a falling off of spontaneous, unassisted emigration from Europe.

Brazil.—The sudden collapse of the Imperial Government in November, resulting in the downfall of Dom Pedro and his banishment, caused universal surprise. For some time the

Government had been credited by the Republican journals with the wish and intention to disperse the army throughout the provinces and along the frontier, so that, with the assistance of the newly-organised National Guard, the succession of the Princess Imperial to the throne might be secured in the event of the death or incapacity through old age of the Emperor Dom Pedro. An infantry battalion, ordered to embark for a distant province, mutinied and refused to go. The War Department resolved to compel them by force to depart. "On the morning of the 15th inst., that part of the population of Rio which was not in the secret was surprised, and many were alarmed, by the movement of marines, sailors, and police through the streets towards the Campo Sant'Anna, and the report soon spread that two battalions of regular troops had refused to obey the orders for their embarking for the provinces, and that force was to be employed to quell the mutiny. This rumour was quickly followed by the news that not only a revolt but a revolution was imminent, the whole garrison of Rio having abandoned the Government, that the Ministers were prisoners, that the Minister of Marine had been killed.

"The first result was the closing of the banks and nearly all of the stores and shops, the Custom House, and public departments, and the congregation of crowds in the streets, who, however, did not appear to understand exactly what the gravity of the situation really was. During the whole day the spectators were rather indifferent, and there was a noticeable lack of enthusiasm among the people everywhere.

"Early in the morning Gen. Manoel Deodoro da Fonseca, who, ill in bed, had been informed the preceding night that the 2nd Brigade, in quarters at San Christovão, would revolt, and counted upon his assistance, placed himself at the head of two regiments, 1st and 9th Cavalry, and a battery of artillery, 2nd, and proceeded to besiege the Sant'Anna barracks, occupied also as general head-quarters of the army, and where the Ministry was assembled, and intimated the Premier to resign the government. A mutinous disposition was apparent among the troops in barracks, and the 10th Battalion refused to leave for the purpose of turning back the military students who were expected from their school at Botafogo. Finally, whether by orders or spontaneously, the barracks gate was thrown open, Gen. Deodoro rode in, passed by the troops drawn up in parade, who saluted him, and finally returned to the street accompanied by the whole garrison, the Ministers witnessing the spectacle from the windows of the head-quarters. The Adjutant-General of the army and Gen. Deodoro then had a short conference, after which the two generals proceeded to where the Ministry was met, and Gen. Deodoro, declaring the motives for the revolt, and the deposition of the Cabinet, ordered the arrest of Visconde de Ouro Preto, the Premier, and Candido de Oliveira, Minister of Justice, and

lately acting as Minister of War, to whom he declared that the army demanded their expatriation in satisfaction for the persecution exercised by them when in power. The two Ministers were afterwards relieved of arrest, and in the afternoon the whole Cabinet returned to their homes under escort and without molestation. The only serious affair had occurred previously to the surrender of the Cabinet. Barão do Ladario, Minister of Marine, had left the barracks to give some orders, and on his return was ordered to surrender by an officer of Gen. Deodoro's escort. The Minister is said to have drawn a revolver and snapped it at this officer, and upon the general repeating the demand for his surrender, to have fired a shot at him which missed. Shots were then fired upon him, and he fell with four wounds, none of which are serious, although one was severe. With this exception there appears to have been no bloodshed.

"Before the Ministers finally surrendered, they, between 11 and 12 o'clock, had telegraphed the Emperor at Petropolis asking to resign, and declaring that, after consultation with various general officers, it was decided that resistance was impossible. The Emperor at once took a special train on the Rio and Northern Railway, and, coming overland, reached the city palace between 2 and 3 p.m., accompanied by the Empress, and where he was shortly after joined by the Princess Imperial and Conde d'Eu and many distinguished men, irrespective of political parties, besides family and personal friends. Among the visitors was the commander of the Chilian ironclad, to whom the Emperor is reported to have expressed a belief that the disturbance was only temporary. At about 3.30 p.m. the late Premier, Visconde de Ouro Preto, arrived at the palace and personally tendered the resignation of the Ministry. After the usual refusal this was accepted, and, on request, he suggested as his successor Senator Silveira Martins, who was shortly expected here, but, it afterwards appeared, whose arrest had been ordered by the revolutionary government at Sta. Catharina. The Emperor then expressed a desire to confer with General Deodoro, who could not be found; and Senators Dantas and Correia, who had volunteered to visit the general, returned with information that the Provisional Ministry had been formed, many of the higher officials appointed, and that the army, losing all faith in the monarchical parties, had joined hands with the Republicans; further, that various provinces had already declared their adherence to the movement. The Princess and her husband came to the city by water, after sending their children, under charge of their tutor, to Petropolis. Later on a force of infantry and cavalry reported to the gentleman on duty with the Emperor and mounted guard, refusing entrance to all who did not obtain permission from the Emperor's attendant. At 9 p.m. Senator Saraiva, who had only just arrived from Europe, was sent for, and at 11.20 a meeting of the Council of State, attended by

Liberals and Conservatives, was held, when it was unanimously decided to form a new Government; but the attempt was a failure, for the Provisional Government had taken possession of all the Government departments." The organiser of the mutiny was Colonel Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães, an officer of exceptional ability and Professor in the Military Academy. The movement seemed directed at first only against the obnoxious Ouro Preto Ministry; but the enthusiasm of the Republicans under the leadership of a popular agitator, Jose de Patrocinio, was so very pronounced, that at a meeting held in the City Hall, in the afternoon of Nov. 15, a resolution proclaiming the Republic was passed by acclamation. About the same hour, a self-constituted committee, consisting of General Deodoro, Benjamin Constant, and Quintino Bocayuva, met and organised a Provisional Government, consisting of the following persons:— Marshal Mancel Deodoro da Fonseca, Chief of the Provisional Government; Aristides da Silveira Lobo, Minister of the Interior; Ruy Barbosa, Minister of Finance and *ad interim* of Justice; Lieutenant-Colonel Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães, Minister of War; Commodore Eduardo Wandenkolk, Minister of Marine; Quintino Bocayuva, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and *ad interim* of Agriculture, Commerce, and Public Works. The following appointments, in addition to the above, were made on Nov. 15 by the Provisional Government:—Manoel Ferraz de Campos Sales, Minister of Justice; Demetrio Ribeiro, Minister of Agriculture, Commerce, and Public Works.

A formal decree was issued declaring a federal Republic, the several provinces of the late empire constituting the States, and each State arranging its own constitution and electing its deliberative bodies and local governments.

On the morning of the 16th the deposed Emperor received intimation that he and his family must leave the country within twenty-four hours:—"Between 2 and 3 o'clock on the morning of the 17th an officer appeared at the palace and informed the Emperor that he must at once embark, with all the members of his family. The wretched old man protested that he was not a fugitive, and that he preferred to embark by day; but after listening to the officer's explanation that a conflict might occur and blood might be shed, he finally yielded, protesting that in such a crisis his old grey head was the only one that was cool. And so at the dead hour of night, with no one to say a farewell and bid him Godspeed, the aged Emperor, with his devoted wife and children, went down to the Caes Pharos, where a launch was waiting to convey them out to the small gunboat *Parnahyba*. About 10 o'clock the gunboat steamed out of the harbour and went down to Ilha Grande to wait for the merchant steamer *Alagoas*, which had been chartered to convey the exiles to Europe; and before the day came to an end the people of 'the loyal and heroic city of St. Sebastian of Rio de Janeiro,' as the official title

of this city runs, knew that their old Emperor was safely beyond Cape Frio under the escort of the ironclad *Riachuelo*."

It was said that the Imperial Ministry, principally through the instrumentality of Ouro Preto, had arranged with Dom Pedro to abdicate at the end of January 1890 in favour of his daughter, the Countess d'Eu. But the Countess, with her husband, was extremely unpopular with the army and navy, and from these the feeling of disloyalty to the throne spread rapidly among the people.

By decree of the Provisional Government, the provinces of Brazil, united by the tie of federation, were to be styled the "United States of Brazil," and general elections were to take place in August 1890 to confirm the establishment of the Republic.

A counter-revolution broke out in Rio on Dec. 18. A number of soldiers, sailors, and civilians took part in it, and troops had to be ordered out to disperse them. It was not until the 20th that the disturbance was finally quelled.

Bolivia.—The differences which existed for some time between Bolivia and Paraguay with respect to antagonistic boundary claims were happily adjusted by the intervention of the Argentine Republic, which accepted the part of arbitrator. Bolivia is the third largest silver-producing country in the world, and its silver mines annually yield from ten to twelve millions of dollars. This is accomplished under some disadvantages, as the country has no railways and almost no fuel. All the silver mines were worked by the Spaniards, and many of them for a long period by the Incas.

Chili.—At the opening of Congress (June 1), President Balmaceda stated in his message that the economic prosperity of the country was on a firm basis. The ordinary revenue of the Government for 1888 was \$50,183,938, and the expenditure \$46,135,500. The revenue for 1890 was estimated at \$56,000,000. The value of imports in 1888 was \$60,717,698, and of exports \$73,089,935. There was a marked falling off in the export of bar copper, and the outlook of the copper industry was decidedly sombre. The President considered it the first duty of the Government to improve the army and navy. Chilean finance is very dependent on the export duty on nitrate. With regard to the nitrate industry there was considerable jealousy felt and expressed because the profits on an article essentially a Chilean monopoly went chiefly into the pockets of foreigners. The President, in a speech at Santiago, referring to the absence of native credit and capital in connection with nitrate, said:—"The foreigner explores these riches and takes the profit of the country's native wealth in order to give to other lands and unknown people the treasures of our soil—our own property—and the riches we require."

The Cabinet resigned *en masse* on Oct. 8, without giving any

reason, although it was supposed the resignation occurred on account of a disagreement with President Balmaceda respecting the Presidential candidate.

Ecuador.—Nothing of great importance happened in the republic during the year. On June 20, President Antonio Floreo unveiled a magnificent bronze statue at Guayaquil of the great liberator, General Simon Bolivar. A new Cabinet was formed December 7, and by the unanimous vote of the Council of State, Dr. Herrera was appointed plenipotentiary for the arrangement of the boundary question with Peru, which has been the cause of some trouble between the two countries.

The Government rejected the proposals of an agent claiming to represent a European Syndicate for the arrangement of the national and external debt, for the construction of a railroad to Quito, and for the establishment of a National Bank, assuming that the agent had no authority to act for the bondholders.

British Guiana.—A serious riot took place at Georgetown, Demerara, March 19, occasioned by a report that a negro boy had been killed by a Portuguese. Bands of blacks broke open and plundered private houses and shops. A Portuguese gunsmith, who had been pelted with stones, fired at the mob, and shot an Arab among them, which aroused the negroes to the highest pitch of fury. The rioting spread into the adjoining towns, and the Governor, being appealed to, declined to call out the troops, but gave orders for swearing in special constables. These were stoned by the mob, and some were seriously hurt. Finally the Governor despatched a vessel to Barbadoes requesting the attendance of a war-ship, and a few days later Her Majesty's ship *Canada* arrived off the town and landed a force of 100 marines, which soon quelled the disturbance.

Paraguay.—The financial credit of the country, which sank to a low ebb after the war, was beginning to improve. In 1878, the Government found it difficult to realise a credit operation of \$50,000; in 1882 it could not raise a foreign loan of \$250,000; but in 1885 it bought on credit for \$1,200,000 the Central Paraguayan Railway, and in 1886 contracted for the extension of the railway to Villa Rica for \$1,400,000. The imports during 1888 were of the value of \$3,289,757, while in 1887 they were \$2,442,726. The exports amounted to the value of \$2,588,608, and in the previous year they were \$2,005,610. The internal debt was reduced to \$766,239.

Peru.—A special Session of the Peruvian Congress was convened on January 1, to consider the terms of the Grace-Donoughmore contract, but it closed on February 16 without taking any action. This result was brought about by obstructionists in the Congress, by the opposition of Chili, and by the protest of the French Government. By the terms of the Grace-Donoughmore contract, the absolute cancellation of the Peruvian foreign debt would be effected. It provides for the cession of all the national

railways to the bondholders for sixty-six years, after which time the roads are to be returned to the State in good condition. Three millions of tons of guano were to be ceded to the bondholders if that quantity could be found, and out of the net proceeds the Government was to receive twenty-five per cent. Chili will continue to bar the way to the conclusion of this contract until the Peruvian bondholders agree to the terms of the Ancon treaty of peace, and thereby relieve Chili from all responsibility of the Peruvian debt. Chili, by the same treaty, has a claim upon the guano, and the bondholders will probably consent to a clause in the contract such as the Chilean Government requires.

Numerous fires occurred in Lima in August, causing great loss of property, which were extinguished with much difficulty.

Uruguay.—The great progress which this country made during the year was chiefly due to the establishment of a better government. Heretofore continual revolutions were disturbing the values of property and paralysing business. The House of Representatives was packed with one political party, and fair and honourable legislation was quite ignored. Under a more stable and satisfactory government the value of property has doubled and trebled within the last two years.

Some commotion was caused (August 25) by the discovery of a plot to kill President Tajeo and other prominent persons connected with the Government, by the explosion of dynamite bombs. Three hundred bombs were found, which were to be thrown at the President and his party as they were leaving the cathedral. There were those, however, who considered the plot as only a pretence to affect the share market.

The troubles of the neighbouring Argentine Republic were having some effect upon the country, where speculations in land and in other property were carried on with Argentine money or credit, but yet Uruguayan affairs were never so bright or promising.

Venezuela.—Trade and commerce were not materially injured by the unsettled state of political affairs of the preceding year, and although a severely contested presidential contest kept the country in a ferment during most of the year 1889, the Republic showed marked progress. This improvement was chiefly due to the increase of railway communication. Several railways were in course of construction, and the harbour of La Guayra, where great improvements were being made, was nearly completed in October. The country was, on the whole, prosperous, and enjoying perfect peace, which is saying much for a South American Republic. The only industry that showed a very considerable falling off in its prosperity was the gold-mining industry in the Yururari territory.

CHAPTER VIII.

AUSTRALASIA.

THE general history of the British Colonies in the South Pacific has been, during the year 1889, one of uninterrupted peace and prosperity, with a marked increase in the tendencies towards a closer union and in the development of a local sentiment in harmony with a wider spirit of Imperial nationality. The record is one of universal progress and improvement, in numbers, in wealth, in commerce, and in industry. The revenue, although not truly a test of the colonial resources, seeing that it is in great part assisted by the sums realised by the alienation of the public estate, continues to increase "by leaps and bounds," even to the embarrassment of colonial financiers. The population returns are so far satisfactory as that they exhibit an ever-increasing rate of natural growth, without any appreciable help from immigration. The public credit, if we may judge by the intrepidity with which new loans are undertaken and the ease with which they are raised, shows no signs of deterioration, though one or two of the colonies in the first twelve months have experienced some severe physical and financial trials. In spite of bad seasons and pecuniary depression, it may be said that the year 1889 has been one of unexampled material success in the history of Australasia.

Politically the history of the year has been marked by the recrudescence of two questions of vital importance to the future of the Australasian colonies in the solution of which Great Britain in her Imperial character is materially concerned. These two questions, which sensibly involve, even if they do not directly affect, the future relations of England to her Australian dependencies, are the development of the Australian federal system and the future disposition of the vast territory of Western Australia. As signs of the rapid political growth of Australia in the direction of national unitarian sentiment, they are worthy of the serious attention of British politicians. The colony of New South Wales, which has hitherto stood aloof from the scheme of Australian confederation, at the instance of Sir Henry Parkes, its veteran Minister (whose star is once more in the ascendant), has proposed to the other Governments a federal system going far beyond the bounds of the existing one, and having for its object the creation of an Australian Dominion on the model of the Canadian. In a letter addressed to Mr. Gillies, the Victorian Premier, in August last, Sir Henry Parkes maintained that the time had come to provide for the united action of the Australian colonies in the matter of their external defence, and insisted that the only authority which could be sufficient for this purpose was a federal executive Government ruling by

means of a Federal Parliament. The scheme as suggested would resemble that of the Government and Parliament of Canada, the Federal Parliament to consist of two houses, with supreme authority, under a Governor-General appointed by the Crown, over the local colonial Legislatures. Such a measure, to judge from the criticisms which have been passed upon it in the colonies, would seem to be in advance of their requirements. Public opinion, doubtless influenced by the local jealousies among the colonies, especially between New South Wales and Victoria, is not yet ripe for so large and sweeping a project, nor have the motives of the proposer escaped criticism. Sir Henry Parkes has hitherto been conspicuous as the most strenuous opponent of Australian Federation, and his rivals are naturally disposed to be suspicious of his sudden conversion and new attitude. In his elaborate reply to the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Gillies formally stated his objections to the larger federation scheme. He did not think that there was any present prospect of bringing out the proposed Australian Dominion. The main difficulty with Mr. Gillies was obviously the collision in which the rival authorities, the Federal Government and the Colonial Government, would be involved. "It appears to me," Mr. Gillies wrote on August 12, "that, going on those lines, it would be impossible to stop short of granting it (the Federal Parliament), the supreme authority necessarily involving the power to levy taxes." At present the supreme authority is, in all but the name, in the hands of the Legislature of each colony, to deal with its own affairs. Mr. Gillies suggests that the immediate practical question before the colonies demanding solution is how to secure united action for defence purposes. Such a duty the existing Federal Council, he argues, could discharge, provided it were united and loyally supported by the various colonies. Sir Henry Parkes is reminded that it is he alone who has thwarted the scheme of union, by using his influence to prevent New South Wales from joining the Federal Council. Let us then, Mr. Gillies suggests, first complete our smaller union before proceeding to the larger. He is impressed with the belief that, "through the Federal Council, in its enlarged basis, we might be able to consider and formulate proposals of a larger federation"; and his deliberate judgment is "that by far the greatest hope we can have of a larger federation becoming a fact in the near future lies in working it by means of the smaller federation which we have in our hands now."

Queensland responded to the proposal of New South Wales in very similar terms. Mr. B. D. Morehead, the Colonial Secretary, in a despatch dated November 18, fully sympathised with the idea of a Federal Dominion, but was persuaded that the Dominion Parliament should supersede the Federal Council by the development of the latter, and not by its displacement. He concurred with Mr. Gillies in the suggestion that the members of

the Federal Council should be summoned to a conference to consider Sir Henry Parkes's proposals. South Australia and Tasmania have expressed identical views. Indeed, it may be assumed that New South Wales stands alone in this proposal of an Australian Federal Dominion, just as she stood alone in refusing to join the Federal Council. On these questions we may expect that the colonies are by no means likely to come to any immediate agreement; and it is probable that they are yet very far from being agreed on the first and necessary point, namely, what is to be the object of the Union, and what the end of the larger federation—whether it is intended to develop into a federation still larger, namely, that of the whole empire; or whether its unity begins and ends with making Australia one and sufficient to itself. Another question, in which there has been generated a very sudden and singular amount of heat in the colonies, is that regarding the future government of Western Australia; and in this again we find Sir Henry Parkes, representing New South Wales opinion, taking a leading part—a coincidence which, if we regard the spirit of one and the other movement, cannot but appear as highly significant. In obedience to the wishes of the people of Western Australia—a settlement numbering less than 50,000 but yesterday advanced from being a penal into a Crown colony—the Imperial Government, eager, as usual, to throw off the burden of ruling a colony, introduced a Bill in the last session of Parliament, providing for the establishment of what is called Constitutional or Parliamentary Government over the greater part of the enormous area—over 1,000,000 square miles—included in the term Western Australia—a portion of the Northern territory, scarcely inhabited, and but imperfectly explored, being reserved to the Crown, with a view to its creation hereafter into a separate colony. Through the opposition mainly of certain independent members of both parties (chiefly Liberal), the Bill failed of passing through Parliament. The subject is naturally one which has a great interest for Australians; yet we may find it difficult to comprehend the spirit in which the action of the Imperial Government and of Parliament has been received in the Colonies. Undoubtedly the main, if not the only, source of the opposition made to the West Australian Bill was a belief, sincere in itself, and certainly not influenced by any hostility to the principle of free government, or to Australia, that the administration of the vast domain accidentally included within the territory called Western Australia (vast even when limited as proposed under the Bill) could not safely be entrusted, in the interest of the people of the Empire at large whose heritage it is, to the handful of local residents who would have to constitute the Government of Western Australia. Another sound and reasonable objection to the measure was that it professed to multiply and perpetuate some of those geographical difficulties which have already been experienced through the

•

careless and unscientific division of the Australian continent into colonies. Western Australia—including more than a third of the whole continent—with a territory five times as large as that of France, extending over fifteen degrees of latitude, with an indefinite and impracticable inland frontier, may reasonably be supposed to be far too large for a colony, even by Australian colonists. As for the right of the 50,000 persons who reside in three or four townships along the coast to enjoy all this magnificent estate as their own, or at least to dispose of it at their will and mainly for their benefit, that may also reasonably be disputed. In Australia, however, and mainly in New South Wales, the question has been viewed in a spirit of purely local patriotism.

The last year has witnessed the birth of an agitation with the cry "Australia for the Australians," which may be regarded as the beginning of a very formidable movement, not unlikely to be attended with consequences affecting the future of the relations with England. In New South Wales the matter was taken up by Sir Henry Parkes, who used it with some dexterity in aid of his new position in regard to federation. In a remarkable speech delivered in the Sydney Assembly on August 7, the Premier maintained that "the future of the Australian colonies ought to be purely Australian." He argued that the very existence of Western Australia under a government different from the other colonies was a hindrance to their free development, an impediment to federation. He was cordially supported by Mr. Dibbs, the leader of the Opposition, who even went beyond his opponent in his zeal for preserving the Australian soil sacred from the encroachment of Imperial authority, arguing that the colonists were more to be trusted in the administration of the lands than "the adventurers and speculators" who would necessarily exercise that privilege under the control of the Crown. The Sydney House of Assembly agreed by a unanimous vote to support the demand of unrestricted free government for Western Australia. In Victoria, in Queensland, and in South Australia similar motions have been carried through the Legislatures, and it may be assumed that the Australian colonies have at last found a subject on which they could all agree, which is, that the Imperial Government should abandon, for Australia, even that shadow of direct rule which is maintained in a Crown colony.

The strike of the dockyard labourers in London in August of last year called forth an extraordinary amount of interest and of sympathy throughout the Australian colonies, with results such as have astonished both the sympathisers and those who benefited by their liberality. Upon the first news of the agitation in England in favour of higher wages for the dockers, and, as it appeared afterwards, upon a mistaken impression of the facts of the case, large sums of money were collected in the principal cities and remitted in aid of the labourers on strike.

Not the local trade-unions only, but all classes of the community, including artisans, tradesmen, merchants, capitalists, and politicians, contributed to the relief of what they believed to be a real grievance, and in support of what they were persuaded was a legitimate movement. Upwards of 22,000*l.* were collected in Victoria alone, and, according to the estimate of one of the leading journals, a sum of not less than 50,000*l.* was remitted to England from all the colonies. This liberality was all the more remarkable, seeing that, while the Australian Chambers of Commerce took the lead in stimulating the public benevolence, it was the Australian shippers and the Australian merchants who suffered most by the dockyard strike. The unexpected and most opportune aid thus contributed from Australia contributed no little to prolong and embitter the struggle between the masters and the men in London, and by the acknowledgment of the leaders of the strikers, was the main cause of the ultimate success of the movement, while it undoubtedly encouraged, if it did not provoke, the kindred movements which followed. Mr. Burns himself publicly said of the Australian contribution, that it was "the backbone of the strike." Upon a fuller knowledge of the circumstances of the case, however, and especially after the somewhat tardy and imperfect account rendered by the committee of the expenditure of the large sums received from Australia, there followed a considerable revulsion of feeling among the subscribers to the relief fund. The money which was subscribed in aid of distress, and for the most part in ignorance of the matters in dispute between the masters and the men, was discovered to have been expended mainly in support of the general cause of trade-unionism and on the side of labour in the battle against capital; but of the 50,000*l.* sent from Australia, 12,000*l.* were reimbursed by the strike committee to the English trade-unions. Of the balance the Australians have found so much difficulty in obtaining a proper account, that it is probable that on the next appeal of this kind even the working classes in the "operatives' paradise" will be somewhat less enthusiastic in responding so generously, especially when they realise that one certain result of their liberality will be to open the doors of their Eden to their starving fellow-workmen in England.

New South Wales.—The revenue returns for 1888 were published on January 2. They exhibit, on the whole, a favourable picture of the continued progress and ever-increasing prosperity of the colony. The total yield for the year was 8,886,360*l.*, being in excess of the Treasurer's latest estimate, and an increase of over 300,000*l.* over the revenue for 1887. Of this sum only 2,682,144*l.* was obtained by direct taxation, the balance being raised from the proceeds of the land sales, and from the railways, tramways, postal and telegraph services. Compared with the population of 1,060,000 people, the revenue gives an average of 8*l.* 7*s.* 9*d.* a head, which is probably a larger national income

were held under pastoral leases, 4,500,000 under annual leases, 54,500,000 under occupation (grazing) licences, 6,500,000 under constitutional leases, and 4,000,000 acres under homestead leases. The total area unsold yielded a rent to the State of 718,642*l*. After three weeks' debate the second reading of the Land Bill was passed on June 5, after a division, which proves that the House was practically unanimous on the measure, the numbers being 68 to 3. The Bill was finally passed on July 24, by a majority of 64 to 11, with certain important amendments, of which one is that the area open to purchase in the eastern division shall be reduced to 320 acres, and another that at the expiration of the present pastoral leases no claim shall accrue to the tenant, but the lands shall be absolutely reserved by the Crown. The Land Bill has since been passed through the Legislative Council, and may be regarded as the most important work of the session of 1889, and perhaps the greatest legislative achievement by which any of Sir Henry Parkes' numerous administrations has been distinguished.

One of the principal measures under discussion in Parliament was the Payment of Members Bill. A motion affirming the desirability of this constitutional change (which has been adopted by the neighbouring colony of Victoria for more than twenty years) was brought forward in the Assembly by Mr. Waddell on April 9, and although opposed by Sir Henry Parkes and by most of his colleagues, was carried by a majority of 45 to 25. A Bill to give effect to the principle was introduced by Mr. O'Connor, the Postmaster-General, and carried through its several stages after a brief debate, in spite of the strong opposition of Sir Henry Parkes. It was read a second time in the Legislative Council by the narrow majority of 26 to 22. In committee an amendment by Dr. Garran, providing that the payment shall be limited to the two next succeeding Parliaments only, was adopted on July 17 by a majority of 24 to 14. With some other amendments the Bill was passed, and returned to the Assembly, upon which there ensued an angry contention between the two Houses, with the promise of a deadlock. The point in dispute is almost identical with that which has always caused a friction in the working of the bi-cameral institutions in the Colonies. The Assembly, under the guidance of the Prime Minister, who, though he had opposed the Bill, declared himself an uncompromising advocate of the constitutional rights of the Lower House, insisted that the Council, though it might reject, had no power of amending a money Bill. Sir Henry Parkes protested that by its amendments the Council had insulted the Assembly. The Bill related to the Assembly alone. The Council, after affirming the principle that payment of Members was desirable, proceeded to dictate to the Assembly how the salaries of members should be paid. The Council had exceeded its powers and forgotten its place in the Constitution

He therefore moved the suspension of the standing orders with the view of passing the Payment of Members Bill through all its stages and again presenting it to the Upper House without amendments. The motion was carried without debate, and the Bill was once more sent to the Council. Eventually, the Upper House gave way, and the measure for paying each member of the Assembly the sum of 300*l.* a year has been carried into law.

Among the proceedings of the New South Wales Legislature, perhaps one of the most important, as affecting the Imperial relations, was the address to Her Majesty, voted by both Houses, regarding Western Australia. The Address, as moved by Sir Henry Parkes in the Assembly, referred to the Bill before the Imperial Parliament for the granting of the full rights of self-government to the colony of Western Australia, and urged the justice and expediency of passing such a measure into law without delay. It further declared that every portion of the said colony, not included within the provinces of the new Imperial Bill, should henceforth be reserved for, and as soon as practicable brought under, a form of government similar to that of the other colonies, to be held exclusively for the purposes of Australian settlement and colonisation by people from the other colonies and from Great Britain and Ireland. In moving the Address Sir Henry Parkes announced views, amidst the general applause of the House, regarding the future of Australia which were somewhat remarkable, as evidencing the growth of a united Australian nationality. While professing a sincere loyalty and devotion to the Crown, and repudiating any idea of separation, the Prime Minister pointed out that in the event of the federation of the Colonies becoming necessary the existence of Western Australia under a Government different from that of the others might prove a serious embarrassment. Mr. Dibbs, the leader of the Opposition, even went beyond the Prime Minister in insisting that the future of the Colonies ought to be purely Australian. He particularly dwelt on the public lands being regarded as Australian property, to be administered primarily for the benefit of the colonists in Australia. The address was agreed to unanimously. In the Upper House it was not carried without some discussion, and an amendment affirming the claims of all citizens of the Empire to the right of settling on the lands of Western Australia.

Another question involving the relations of New South Wales with some of her neighbours was agitated in the Assembly, at the instance of Sir Henry Parkes. This was a claim to the waters of the River Murray, which forms the boundary between New South Wales and Victoria. Sir Henry Parkes, in a speech delivered Sept. 5, insisted that the water of the Murray formed part of the territory of New South Wales, and complained of the irrigation and drainage schemes by which that water was wasted and polluted, to the injury of its lawful proprietors.

The chief complaint was against the Water Trusts, which had been created under a Victorian Act, which proposed to irrigate an area of at least 1,600,000 acres in Victoria. Victorians already, it was urged, took more water from the river than their tributaries supplied, and if the extraordinary rights now applied for were granted, not only would the navigation of the Murray be impeded, but the river would be practically drained dry. The Government therefore proposed to create an authority for the control of the River Murray upon the lines of the Thames Conservancy Commission. The matter has since formed the subject of energetic controversy between the two colonies, and is likely to lead to future dissensions between New South Wales and Victoria.

One of the longest and most disorderly sittings on record of the Assembly was brought to a close on Oct. 5. The house sat continuously for forty-eight hours, and much violent language was used on both benches, one member, Mr. Crick, being committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms for unruly conduct and contempt. The subject of contention was a vote to Mr. John Davies, the Chairman of the Council Labour Board, respecting the finances, of which a great deal of laxity was reported. The Parliament was prorogued on Oct. 9.

Parliament was opened again for a short financial session on Nov. 26. The Governor, in his inaugural speech, announced that he had opened negotiations with the other colonies on the subject of confederation, declaring that the question was of "the several colonies comprising Australian territory uniting in the formation of one powerful Australian nation." The Budget was presented to the House by Mr. McMillan on Dec. 4. He declared the finances to be in a sounder and more prosperous condition than for years past. There was a surplus of 52,000*l*. The revenue for 1890 was estimated at 9,329,000*l*., and the expenditure at 9,264,000*l*. The tariff would be adjusted, but there would be no further taxation beyond what was needed for the adjustment. A vote of censure, moved by Mr. Dibbs, against the Government on account of its financial proposals was lost by a majority of twelve on Dec. 12.

On Dec. 19, the Budget Estimates were passed by the Assembly, and Parliament was prorogued on the 21st.

The question of Australian Confederation formed the subject of a long and animated discussion between the Prime Ministers of New South Wales and Victoria, in the course of which it has been made evident that there is a wide divergence of opinion between the two colonies. Sir Henry Parkes, who had already spoken, during a tour in Queensland, in favour of a scheme for a federal military organisation, made a speech at Tenterfield on Oct. 24, in which he, for the first time, gave open and free expression to his views in regard to the new Australian confederation. He urged that the existing Australian Federal

Council was not competent to represent the national feeling, that the time had come for a distinct Executive and Parliament for Australia to deal with national questions. He suggested the holding of a convention of representatives of all the Australian colonies (excluding New Zealand and apparently Tasmania), for the purpose of devising a scheme of Federal Government and Parliament. With these views Sir Henry Parkes entered into a correspondence with Mr. Gillies, who has replied, declining to enter into the scheme, and reminding the New South Wales Premier that there exists already a Federal Council, incomplete only through the abstention of New South Wales, which is competent to deal with the matter. The history of the question as relating more properly to Australasia generally is more fully dealt with under that general head.

Very heavy rains fell, after a long drought, about the beginning of April. In May, during the five days from the 25th to the 29th, nearly twenty inches were recorded, with great floods in some of the country districts. More heavy rains fell in October.

Professor Pasteur's scheme for the extermination of rabbits through the injection of chicken-cholera having been proved, after a lengthened inquiry by colonial experts, to fail of complying with the required tests, the prize of 25,000*l.* offered by Government was withheld.

The deep borings for water in various parts of the colony resulted in much success. At Tilpa, a bore at 940 feet through porous white sandstone yielded a supply of 1,200,000 gallons daily. Another on Dunlop Station, at 750 feet, gave 570,000 gallons a day.

The visit of the Irish Nationalist Delegates to New South Wales, Messrs. Esmonde, Dillon and Deasy, came to an end on Oct. 30. It was announced that a sum of 26,270*l.* had been collected up to date in the Australian colonies.

Extreme heat was recorded in January in some of the south-western districts. At Balranald the thermometer reached 114° in the shade; at Wilcannia 108°; and at Gundagai 104°.

The forty-second Intercolonial Cricket Match was held at Sydney on Jan. 26, 28, and 29, and won by Victoria after an exciting contest by 12 runs.

Victoria.—The year 1889 opened auspiciously for the colony. The excitement produced by the feverish land speculations of 1888 had begun to pass away, and public confidence, confirmed by the ever-increasing revenue returns, was once more restored.

The Governor, Sir Henry Loch, left Melbourne on March 8 on a visit to England. His Excellency, who has been very popular during his term of office, was entertained at a public banquet previous to his departure. Sir William Robinson was sworn in on March 9 as Administrator of the Colony during Sir Henry Loch's absence. The appointment led to some surprise, and was

made the subject of official correspondence between the Chief Justice (Mr. Higinbotham) and the Colonial Office. The usual rule is that the officer next to the Governor in rank should act as his representative during his absence. Sir William F. Stawell, who held the titular office of Lieutenant-Governor, was absent from the colony through ill health. The next in rank was Mr. Higinbotham, the Chief Justice, who, according to the usual rule, should have been made Acting-Governor. During his visit to England Sir Henry Loch was offered, and accepted, the appointment of Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, in succession to Sir Hercules Robinson. Sir Henry Loch, after returning to Melbourne, finally took his departure for the Cape of Good Hope on Nov. 15, amidst an extraordinary manifestation of feeling from all classes of the colonists. The new Governor, the Earl of Hopetoun, arrived in Melbourne on Dec. 5, and met with an enthusiastic reception.

At a crowded meeting of the electors of Kew held on March 11, Mr. Gillies, the Prime Minister, announced the Ministerial programme for the coming general election. He reviewed the work of the Coalition Government during the six years it had held office, and explained and defended its chief measures. The Government had done all in its power to consolidate the federal sentiment in Australia. Mr. Gillies hoped that all the colonies would soon join in making the Federal Council representative of Australia, and entitled to speak with a united voice in all questions, whether Imperial or otherwise. He claimed that his Ministry had done their best to prevent New Guinea and other islands from falling into the hands of foreign nations. On the fiscal policy they had endeavoured faithfully to carry out the public will. He announced various new measures of internal administration, but declared his hostility to the prospect of a stock tax, as likely to lead to reprisals from the neighbouring colonies and to injure the cause of federation.

The general elections began on March 28. The final result of the polling was to give the Ministry a decisive victory over their opponents. Of the 95 members returned 33 were new to Parliament. The majority in favour of the Government was more than two to one. All the Ministers were re-elected, while of the leaders of the Opposition only Mr. Bent was successful in retaining his seat. Mr. Bent, in consequence of his private misfortunes, has since retired from his position. The new Parliament was formally opened on April 9; Mr. M. H. Davies (who has since received the honour of knighthood) being unanimously re-elected as Speaker. The Opposition was found to be very feeble in numbers, and much disorganised on account of differences of opinion on the stock tax. The vacancy in the Cabinet caused by the retirement of Mr. Walker from the control of the Customs was filled up by the appointment of Mr. J. B. Patterson, an old and experienced politician, who had once been

a strong opponent of the Government. After a short recess Parliament was opened again for business on June 4 by Sir William Robinson, the Acting-Governor. Mr. Gillies brought forward various proposals for the reform of Procedure, including the Closure. At a subsequent sitting the Closure was abandoned in deference to the opinion of the House. Mr. James Munro was chosen leader of the Opposition. The resignation, by Mr. Nimmo, of his post of Minister of Public Works, led to some agitation among the democratic followers of the Government. A country party, consisting of members favourable to taxes on stock and agricultural produce, from both sides of the House, was formally constituted.

On July 30 Mr. Gillies delivered his Budget speech, which, though highly favourable as exhibiting a great and improving increase in the public revenue, contained some unexpected proposals in the direction of further protection, and higher duties were announced on various agricultural products imported from the neighbouring colonies, including fruit and dairy produce, which nothing in the Treasurer's statement seemed to justify. The revenue for 1888-89, estimated at 7,792,624*l.*, had actually amounted to 8,674,710*l.*; while the expenditure, estimated at 8,552,553*l.*, was no more than 8,015,909*l.* The net result, in spite of the extraordinary expenditure on the Exhibition, showed an increase in the surplus of 714,066*l.*, the total surplus on the year ending June 30, 1889, being 1,607,550*l.* This large sum Mr. Gillies proposed to get rid of by increased expenditure on public buildings, by railway grants to the extent of 405,000*l.*, by municipal endowments, by agricultural bonuses to the extent of 250,000*l.*, by rabbit-proof fences to the extent of 150,000*l.*, and by a redemption of 276,000*l.* of six per cent. debentures. The fiscal policy thus announced cannot be said to have added to the confidence which the Government have hitherto enjoyed. It has pleased neither section of its supporters, and while the farmers are discontented at the small amount of additional taxation on foreign produce, which does not include a duty upon imported stock, the free traders are naturally displeased by the addition to the tariff of a number of petty duties, not called for by the state of the revenue or sufficient to constitute any legitimate measure of protection. A motion was brought forward in the Assembly by Mr. McLean, demanding on behalf of the farmers and stock-keepers a larger measure of protection, which was treated by the Government as a vote of censure, and after several nights' debate, was lost by a majority of 52 to 21, several members of the country party voting with the Government. The result may be regarded as indicating that the Coalition Government still retains the confidence of a majority of the colonists, or rather that there is no party at present strong enough to replace it. In the progress of the Budget proposals through the House the ministry have shown a disposition to yield still further to the demands of the Protec-

•

tionists. There has been a general increase of duties on all articles supposed to come into competition with native industry. The Budget was finally carried on Nov. 5, and Parliament, after passing several unimportant measures, was prorogued on the 25th of that month.

An Act to facilitate divorce was one of the principal measures of the session. It has been passed in opposition to the feeling of the Churches, and, being at variance with the English law, was reserved by the Governor for the Queen's assent.

An Act for the establishment of a uniform penny postage in the colony will come into force at the beginning of the year.

The attitude of the Victorian Government in regard to the Confederation Scheme, proposed by Sir Henry Parkes, has already been indicated. Stated briefly, Mr. Gillies' position is that, whatever steps are taken for an Australian Dominion, should proceed through the federal machinery already in existence, and by the development of the Federal Council, of which up to this time New South Wales had refused to be a member.

Although the Victorian Government declined to join in the proposal to hold a special inter-colonial conference on the subject of Western Australia, both Houses of the Legislature joined in an address to the Crown on Aug. 15, praying that powers similar to those enjoyed by the other Australian colonies might be conferred on Western Australia, that she might be endowed with a full measure of responsible government, so that the cause of Australian federation and unity might be advanced, and Western Australia be added to "the group of loyal, contented, and autonomous colonies."

The visit of Sir Somers Vine to Victoria, on behalf of the Imperial Institute, was successful in drawing the attention of the colonists to that enterprise. The sympathy of the people and the Legislature has been shown in a substantial addition to the funds of the Institute.

The question of Imperial Federation was the subject of agitation in the colony. Mr. Parkin, a delegate from Canada, delivered several lectures, which were very well received by large and influential audiences. An attempt by Sir Archibald Michie, an ex-Minister, to deride the cause of Imperial Federation in a lecture intended to be humorous, was met with marked ill-favour.

Major-General Edwards's report on the defensive organisation of Australia was made public by the Government on Oct. 14, and excited great attention. General Edwards gave it as his opinion that the Australian colonies offer a rich and tempting prize to the enemy. Their want of cohesion and power of combination was pointed out as the great danger. General Edwards's recommendations include a scheme for a combined Australian military force, to be composed of three brigades each to be furnished by Victoria and New South Wales, and one each by Queensland and

South Australia, to be commanded by an officer of the rank of Lieutenant-General. It was urged by General Edwards that, while England expends one-third of her income in defence, and the United States one-sixth, Australia expends but one-fortieth. With respect to the Victorian military forces in particular, General Edwards reported that they were in a satisfactory condition, the defences of Port Phillip being well designed and efficient.

The Centennial Exhibition was closed on Jan. 31. Although the total attendance during the six months it was open amounted to nearly two millions of people, the exhibition was not a financial success. The total expenditure amounted to 244,000*l.*, which was not covered by the receipts, leaving a deficiency to be supplied by the Government.

There was a great outbreak of typhoid fever and diphtheria in the colony during the year. Up to May 31, there were 789 cases of typhoid in Victoria.

The population of Victoria on Dec. 31, 1888, was estimated at 1,090,860, showing a slight preponderance over New South Wales. The population of Melbourne with its suburbs was 419,490.

Sir William Foster Stawell, for many years Chief Justice of Victoria, and a member of the Executive Government before the introduction of a Constitution, died at Naples on March 14, at the age of seventy-four.

The Victorian obituary of the year includes Mr. Peter Lalor, for many years Speaker in the Legislative Assembly, who was leader of the rebels at the Eureka stockade in 1854, and lost an arm in the fight with the British troops. He died on Feb. 9. Dr. Bromby, a leading schoolmaster and divine, died on March 4. Another eminent colonist deceased this year was Mr. Francis Ormonde, a munificent benefactor, whose patriotic bequests were of the amount of 113,500*l.*, his total gifts in support of various useful works during his lifetime having been estimated at a quarter of a million. On June 4, there died Mr. J. B. Watson, a local millionaire, one of the pioneers of quartz-mining in Victoria, leaving property estimated at a million and a half. Mr. Watson was said to have got thirteen tons of gold out of one mine (the Kentish).

The total trade of Victoria in 1888 amounted in value to 23,972,000*l.* in imports, and 13,853,000*l.* in exports.

The Irish delegates, Messrs Dillon, Esmonde, and Deasy, held several meetings in Melbourne, and were successful in collecting subscriptions from their compatriots.

The Melbourne Cup, the Blue Ribbon of the Australian turf, for a prize of 5,000*l.* besides the stakes of 50*l.* each horse, was run on Nov. 5, and won by Mr. W. T. Jones' Bravo, from a field of twenty horses. The Victorian Racing Club have decided to

add 10,000*l.* to the value of the Cup for next year, thus making it one of the richest prizes in the world.

Queensland.—The new Governor, Sir Henry Norman, arrived at Brisbane on May 1, and met with a very enthusiastic reception. At various points along the route where he touched he was also very heartily greeted, especially at Townsville.

Parliament was opened on May 21 with a speech from the Governor, congratulating the colony on the improved prospects of all the branches of local trade and industry, and in the expansion of the revenue as exhibited by the Treasury returns. Measures for the reform of the Civil Service and for the amendment of the Land Act in a direction to encourage settlement and the improvement of holdings, for the providing of payment for Members of Parliament, and of greater security of tenure to miners, were included in the programme of the session.

The announcement was made that Sir Thomas Mcllwraith, the Premier, had retired from the Cabinet through ill health. He was succeeded by Mr. Morehead, the late Colonial Secretary. The changes were without any political significance.

The Land Bill, including several important changes in the existing system, introduced by Sir Samuel Griffith in 1884, was brought in on June 18. Among the provisions was one for reducing the period for which grazing lands are granted from thirty to twenty years, and for increasing the area of the agricultural blocks to be sold by auction from 40 to 320 acres. Certain concessions were proposed to be granted to pastoral lessees who bored artesian wells. The Minister of Lands dwelt upon the necessity, in the interests of the colonial credit, of increasing the revenue from the sale of lands, preferring to raise money by this means to increasing the Customs duties.

A Bill for the payment of members was carried through both Houses by a small majority, and in spite of a discussion in which nearly all the speakers were opposed to the measure. The Bill proposes to give every member of the Assembly a salary of 300*l.* a year.

The annual Financial Statement was made on Aug. 1 by the Treasurer, who congratulated the House upon the improved condition of the finances. The result of last year's operations showed surplus of receipts over expenditure of 116,846*l.*, which brought down the debit balance on June 30 to 485,165*l.*, the deficit at the beginning of the year having been 602,011*l.* The Government did not propose any additional taxation. The revenue for the current year was estimated at 3,749,000*l.*, and the expenditure at 3,629,814*l.*, leaving a surplus of 119,186*l.* It was assumed that a new loan would have to be raised shortly to cover the expenditure to which the colony was committed and to enable the Government to carry out the public works necessary to the development of the colony.

Both Houses on Aug. 1 adopted an Address to the Crown in

favour of the granting of responsible government to Western Australia. The Address went further than those of the other colonies in praying that any territory which might be excluded from the constitution of Western Australia should be reserved "for settlement under a similar form of Government," in conformity with the declaration of Mr. Morehead that no more Crown colonies should be created in Australia, on the ground that they would impede Australian federation and delay the development of Australian unity. Apparently there is some misapprehension in Queensland, as in the other colonies, as to the motives of those who, in the Imperial Parliament, have blocked the progress of the West Australian Constitution Bill.

A motion for the establishment of a University in Queensland moved by Sir Samuel Griffith, the leader of the Opposition, was rejected by a majority, after a brief discussion, on the ground that the colony was not yet ripe for such an institution.

The Eight Hours Bill was thrown out by the Legislative Council by a majority of 14 to 4.

A Bill was passed making it a criminal offence to import rabbits or transport them from one part of the colony to another.

Owing to serious differences with his colleagues regarding railway expenditure, Sir Thomas Mellwraith resigned his position in September as Vice-President of the Executive Council and a member of the Cabinet. Rumours were rife towards the end of the Session of a probable coalition between Sir Thomas Mellwraith and his old opponent Sir Samuel Griffith.

Another member, Mr. Pattison, the Treasurer, intimated his desire to resign office after the prorogation.

Sir Henry Parkes, the New South Wales Premier, arrived on a visit to the colony in October, in order to discuss with the Queensland Ministry his scheme of Australian Confederation, especially in regard to the formation of a national army and a United Government.

It is believed that the Queensland Ministers are inclined to be more favourable to the policy of New South Wales than to that of Victoria.

After a protracted series of "stone-walling" in the Assembly the Government and the Opposition arrived at a compromise respecting the financial policy of the former, the Loan Bill being cut down to 1,304,000*l.* Parliament was prorogued on Nov. 20.

Some changes in the Ministry were announced on Nov. 19. Mr. Pattison, the Treasurer, resigned office and was succeeded by Mr. J. Donaldson, while Mr. C. Power, hitherto Minister without portfolio, was appointed to Mr. Donaldson's office of Postmaster-General and Secretary of Public Instruction.

The movement for a separation of the Northern district has been revived. A large and enthusiastic meeting was held at Rockhampton, attended by all classes of the people, at which

resolutions were unanimously passed in favour of separation. A committee was appointed in London to advocate the measure.

In the beginning of the year there was great distress throughout the colony on account of the excessive heat and the want of rain. The thermometer in the shade at Windorah registered 127°. The rains began to fall at the end of January, and there were heavy rains again in April. In July there were great floods along the coast, the river Brisbane rising 22 feet above its ordinary level.

The falling off in the yield of sugar in the Northern districts continues. In the year ending March 31 the yield of sugar showed a decrease of 23,967 tons over the year before. The Sugar Commissioners reported by a majority in favour of the continuance of the Polynesian labour supply after 1892, the date at which the present contracts terminate. They were of opinion that if coloured labour be withdrawn the extinction of the sugar industry, in which some four or five millions of capital have been invested, must follow.

There was a great strike of the printing trade in May, which ended in the triumph of the masters.

Mr. Dillon arrived in the colony in June, and held several meetings in favour of Irish Home Rule. Large meetings were held in opposition at Brisbane and several other towns.

The total yield of gold for 1888 was 481,648 ozs., showing an increase of 55,720 ozs. over the previous year. The returns for 1889, it is believed, will place Queensland at the head of the gold-producing colonies of Australia.

South Australia.—Sir William Robinson, who had been Governor of the colony for more than six years, left Adelaide on March 5 for Melbourne, to assume the post of Acting-Governor of Victoria during the absence of Sir Henry Loch. The Earl of Kintore, his successor, arrived at Adelaide on April 13.

The session of Parliament was opened by the new Governor on June 6 in the splendid new building lately erected for the accommodation of members. On June 22 a vote of no-confidence in the Ministry was carried, on the motion of Dr. Cockburn, by a majority of 3. The Ministry thereupon resigned, and Dr. Cockburn was sent for to form a new administration. The new Cabinet includes Mr. J. A. Cockburn as Premier and Chief Secretary; Mr. F. W. Holder, Treasurer; Mr. B. A. Mulden, Attorney-General, and Mr. T. Burgoyne Minister of Lands. On the re-assembling of Parliament on July 16 the Premier made a statement of policy. Important changes were announced in the land laws, including free selection before survey. The Government would give free education up to the existing compulsory standard. A Local Option Bill and various railway extensions were promised. The fiscal policy would be based on staunch protection and strict economy.

An Address to the Crown was passed by both Houses on:

Aug. 3, in terms identical with those of the Victorian address, praying Her Majesty to extend to Western Australia a full measure of responsible Government. The Budget speech was delivered by the Treasurer on Aug. 20. The revenue for the year was estimated at 2,514,709*l.* and a surplus of 83,850*l.* anticipated. Probate duties were abolished, but a scheme of graduated succession duties proposed in their place.

A discussion took place in September on the claim of New South Wales to the water of the Murray River. A Royal Commission was appointed to consider the question so as to effect a settlement between the three colonies concerned. A proposal for a fiscal union on the basis of inter-colonial free trade between South Australia and New South Wales met with little favour in the Assembly, being objected to on protectionist grounds.

Upon the Federal question the discussions in the Legislature show that the colony is inclined to side with Victoria rather than with New South Wales, holding that the existing Federal Council is sufficient to provide the machinery for a further development towards a Confederated Australia.

The prolonged drought from which South Australia, in common with the other colonies, suffered at the beginning of the year was followed by copious rains, which have greatly benefited the pastoral and agricultural interests. The wheat harvest, however, was below the average, being calculated at 6,187,000 bushels, of which 2,500,000 were available for export.

Mr. Dillon and his companions landed at Adelaide by the *Orient* steamer in March, and were successful in raising funds for the Irish Home Rule cause. There have been meetings in favour of the Imperial Institute, promoted by Sir Somers Vine, which were highly successful.

The success of the South Australian wines at the Paris Exhibition was very gratifying to the colonists, and will probably lead to an extension of the wine-making industry.

The returns from the silver mines at Broken Hill and the Barrier have continued to be highly favourable; and the discovery of payable gold deposits in the Northern Territory was reported.

The death of H. G. Searle, the champion sculler of the world, occurred at Adelaide on Dec. 10, from typhoid fever, contracted on board the steamer in which he was an outward passenger. His remains were taken to Sydney, where his funeral was the occasion of an extraordinary popular demonstration.

The population of South Australia in August was estimated at 315,808, showing a slight increase.

Western Australia.—The history of Western Australia, the largest in area and the smallest in population of all the British colonies, in the year 1889 may be said to be almost entirely contained in the agitation connected with the demand for constitutional Government. The Legislative Council, a partly elective and nominative body, under instructions from the Imperial

Government, devoted the greater part of its time in two sessions to the framing of a constitution on the basis of those enjoyed by the other colonies. A Bill was passed in April which embodied all the popular demands as well as certain provisions insisted on by the Colonial Office. The sympathy and co-operation of the neighbouring colonies were invoked in favour of the scheme even before it was presented to the Imperial Legislature, and in response to the invitation of the West Australians addresses to the Crown were voted by all the Colonies in almost identical terms, praying the Crown to grant the same measure of self-government to Western Australia as was enjoyed by her neighbours, to the end that the Federal Australian scheme might be completed. The Constitution Bill for Western Australia was introduced by Lord Knutsford in the House of Lords, and the second reading carried unanimously. After passing through the House of Lords with but very little opposition, the Bill was introduced into the House of Commons at a late period of the Session. After a brief discussion, in the course of which considerable hostility to the measure was developed on both sides of the House, especially among the members below the Liberal gangway, it was announced by the Leader of the House of Commons on Aug. 24 that the Bill would be withdrawn; Mr. W. H. Smith stating that the Government hoped to re-introduce it next Session, "and if necessary refer it to the consideration and examination of a Select Committee." The chief ground on which it is understood the Bill has been opposed in England, is that it proposes to transfer so enormous an extent of territory from the power of the Crown into the hands of so small a community. The total extent of the lands included within the boundaries of Western Australia is more than a million of square miles, and though in the Government Bill it had been proposed to exclude some portion of this enormous area from the Colony to be newly constituted, with a view to the creation of another colony within the territory, it was thought by many in England, especially on the Liberal side of politics, that even with this reservation too much of what is regarded as the property of the whole people of the Empire was sought to be alienated for ever from Imperial control. In the colony, however, there has been much disappointment at the failure of the Constitutional scheme, and a great deal of irritation has been expressed both in the Legislative Council and in public meetings in regard to this question. The main arguments brought forward by the friends of the measure are, that in respect to the objection that the population of Western Australia was out of proportion to the lands sought to be included within its area, an equal if not greater disproportion existed in Queensland, when that colony, in 1859, was endowed with self-government. Moreover, it is urged that the administration of the public lands cannot be placed in better hands than in those of the resident

inhabitants, who are better qualified to discharge the duties of stewardship than the Imperial authorities, who have every motive to encourage their settlement, and to whom, as in the other colonies, the public lands are necessary for the due working of representative institutions and the development of self-government. The public opinion of Western Australia, as proved by numerous meetings and by speeches in the Legislative Council, has been pronounced emphatically in favour of the new Constitution. The local government in November appointed Sir F. Napier Broome, the Governor, whose term of office was shortly to expire, Sir T. C. Campbell and Mr. S. H. Parker, members of the Legislative Council, delegates to London to promote the interests of the Constitution Bill.

The material prospects have considerably improved during the year. The revenue for 1888 was 361,428*l.*, while the expenditure was 385,129*l.* The estimated population at the end of June was 42,745, showing a slight increase. Several valuable discoveries of gold-bearing quartz reefs were reported, one of the richest of which was in the neighbourhood of Perth. What may eventually prove to be even a more valuable source of future wealth, coal, has also been found of excellent quality.

The first through train from Perth to Albany was run on Feb. 14. The Great Southern Railway was formally opened on June 1.

A quarrel between the Chief Justice and the Governor occupied much public attention. The Legislative Council, while declaring Chief Justice Onslow's language in a certain case to be highly intemperate, acquitted him of want of integrity. Lord Knutsford has since announced that the Chief Justice will be provided for elsewhere.

Tasmania.—The Treasurer's financial statement was made on Jan. 8. A proposal to meet the deficit of 160,000*l.* by a graduated income tax was carried by the Speaker's casting vote in the Assembly, the numbers being 15 for and 15 against. On further consideration the minority decided to do without further taxation, a dissolution in the circumstances of the colony being highly inconvenient. The parliamentary session was brought to a close on Feb. 1, the Government obtaining supplies for six months.

Parliament met again on July 9. The Treasurer made his financial statement on July 12. He estimated the revenue for the year at 683,052*l.*, and the expenditure at 670,087*l.* The deficit at the end of 1890 was calculated at 139,981*l.* A motion against the Government, regarding the appointment of Mr. N. T. H. Brown as Conservator of Forests, was defeated on an amendment by 23 to 8.

A Bill to authorise the purchase of the Main Line Railway by the State was passed through the Legislature, the sum of 1,000,000*l.* being offered for the line. An expenditure of 400,000*l.*

on the completion of the Mount Zeehan Line and other public works was sanctioned. The session was closed on Nov. 26.

The population at the end of 1888 was 146,149, showing an increase in the year of 3,871.

The Federal Council was opened at Hobart for business on Jan. 29. Mr. Playford, one of the South Australian delegates, was elected president.

General Edwards's report on the military defences of the Colony was highly unfavourable. According to him, there was nothing to prevent a hostile force of a few hundreds from landing in one of the bays near Hobart, and overpowering the capital. The formation of rifle corps and the creation of permanent works was recommended.

Considerable agitation prevailed in the Colony in consequence of the new Victorian tariff, which imposed additional duties on fruits and cereals, the produce of Tasmania; and retaliation was threatened.

In regard to the federation proposals of Sir Henry Parkes, Tasmania was inclined rather to side with Victoria than with New South Wales, in preferring to wait for the development of the Federal Council.

A loan of 1,000,000*l.* was successfully raised in the London market in April.

New Zealand.—Sir William Jervois, the Governor, left the Colony in January, on the expiration of his term of office. The Earl of Onslow, his successor, landed at Auckland on April 22.

The New Zealand Parliament was opened for the session on June 20. A bill for the amendment of the representative system, of which the chief provision was that all elections for the House of Assembly should be on Hare's system, was introduced, but in view of the hostile attitude of the House quickly withdrawn. A new bill, of which the chief feature was the amalgamation of the urban electorate, was carried through Parliament after a strenuous opposition, marked by an unusual amount of "stone-walling." One sitting of the House of Representatives was continued for over eighty hours. A motion of no confidence in the Ministry, aimed at their financial policy, was defeated by a majority of four. The Parliamentary Session closed on Sept. 17.

Mr. Fisher, the Minister of Education and Commissioner of Customs, resigned office at the beginning of the year, owing to differences of opinion with his colleagues.

Considerable excitement prevailed in February among the settlers and the friendly natives in Poverty Bay, owing to the reported intention of Te Kooti, the leader in the Poverty Bay massacres of twenty years ago, to visit the scene of his old exploits. A vigilance committee was formed at Gisborne to resist Te Kooti, who on his arrival, after making some disturbances, was promptly arrested and committed to gaol. He was

released by the Government after a few days' detention on bail, and sent back to Waikato.

A re-construction of the Ministry was carried out in October. Captain Russell was made Colonial Secretary, Minister of Defence, and Minister of Justice. Mr. Hislop, a newly elected member, became Minister of Education. Mr. T. Fergus exchanged the Ministry of Justice for that of Public Works. Mr. Mitchelson was made Postmaster-General, and Minister for Native Affairs. The Premier, Sir Harry Atkinson, and the Attorney-General, Sir Frederick Whittaker, remain as they were.

There has been a great expansion in the export trade, as shown in the official returns. In the twelve months ending Sept. 30, the total value of the exports was 8,984,987*l.*, that of the imports being 6,120,444*l.*, giving an increase of exports quite singular and unprecedented in the history of the Australasian Colonies. Over a million of carcases of frozen meat were among the exports of 1888, showing an enormous increase in this item alone.

The harvest, which ended in January, was far above the average, and testified to a highly favourable season.

The total revenue at the end of the financial year, March 31, was 3,792,000*l.*, showing an increase of 270,000*l.*

There was an alarming recurrence of volcanic activity from Mount Ruapehu on April 27. Enormous volumes of smoke were seen to issue from the mountain, which has since been more quiet.

The estimated population of the Colony on March 31 was 652,125, of whom 41,969 were Maories.

Much public excitement was manifested in the beginning of the year about Samoa, and public meetings were held to protest against the German aggression.

The visit of the Irish Nationalist delegates to New Zealand was comparatively unfruitful.

An enthusiastic meeting of Unionists was held at Auckland on Nov. 8, denouncing Home Rule as detrimental to the Empire. Similar meetings were held at Wellington and other towns, with the result that the Colonial subscriptions to the Home Rule fund were but small.

New Guinea.—The Governor, Sir William Macgregor, made a highly interesting and most successful exploration among the ranges of Mount Owen Stanley, the supposed highest land in New Guinea. Leaving Port Moresby on April 19 with a party of fourteen men, he ascended the Vanupa river in an open boat for eight days. Reinforced there by thirty natives, the whole party, including four white men, pursued a course inland north-east by east. After a very rough journey across the spurs of the hills they began the ascent of Mount Stanley on June 9, reaching the summit on the 11th. Returning to the coast, they arrived at Port Moresby after an absence of two months, all

well. The only death which occurred was that of a native. The country traversed was very mountainous and difficult, with no tableland. The geological formation was mainly decomposed slate, granite, and quartz, with no signs of gold. The natives were few, and reported as "skittish and superstitious," though friendly. They had cultivation paddocks, fenced in, of sweet potatoes, yams, and sugar-canes. A number of specimens of new birds, plants, and flowers were collected. The climate, above 8,000 feet, is reported as healthy, clear, and cold, with daisies, buttercups, &c. There were heavy frosts at the higher altitudes. No natives were seen above 4,000 feet. The highest point reached was 13,121 feet, and was named Mount Victoria. Sir William Macgregor and his party returned to Port Moresby on June 25, having made what must be regarded as the most important expedition ever conducted into the interior since the territory has become British, which was in every respect successful.

Outrages continue to be reported upon the white adventurers by the natives of the coast. An attack was made in April on the whites, in the Karton River, which resulted in one European being slain.

The gold field in Sudest Island has proved a disappointment. Many of the diggers are leaving, though those that remain are said to be making fair returns. There has been a rush to Thursday Island, where gold deposits have been discovered.

Fiji.—There is little or no history made by Fiji during the year. A great fire broke out at Levuka, the old capital, a large part of the town being burnt, with a total loss to the inhabitants estimated at 50,000*l*.

The population of Fiji was returned at 124,658, of whom 110,754 were native Fijians. Of the total area of 4,953,920 acres, 35,244 were under cultivation by 2,105 Europeans.

Polynesia.—The most important chapter in the year's history was that which was connected with the development of the Samoan difficulty, a question which at one time threatened to attain to the proportions of an international dispute, and was not finally settled without an European Conference. The quarrel between the Germans and the natives of Samoa, headed by the chief Mataafa on behalf of the rightful king Malietoa, culminated in a sanguinary conflict on the beach at Apia on Dec. 18, 1888. The Germans had landed a force of marines and seamen from the warships *Olya* and *Adler* for the purpose of overawing and disarming the followers of Mataafa. They were attacked and driven back by the natives, with the loss of one officer and fifteen men. After being reinforced the Germans were able to recover their ground, and to inflict much loss on Mataafa's men. The news of this conflict, carried to Europe and to America, caused the state of affairs at Samoa to attract the serious attention of the three Powers directly

•

interested, namely, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. The position of Samoa at the beginning of the year may be briefly described. The Germans, under the guidance of their consul, Dr. Knappe, and in pursuance of their policy of treading down the hitherto existent tri-partite influence and establishing German supremacy over the islands, had succeeded in compelling the rightful sovereign Malietooa to abdicate. In his place the Germans set up Tamasee, a man of inferior birth and character, whom the natives declined to receive as their king. The partisans of Malietooa had proclaimed as king the chief Mataafa, who avowedly took that name and exercised the kingly authority on behalf of Malietooa, the legitimate monarch. The quarrel was one which could not but interest the other two Powers who, equally with Germany, had hitherto shared the patronage of the Samoans. The attempt on the part of the local German agents to regulate the native kingship according to their own interests naturally led to energetic protests from the representatives of Great Britain and the United States, and most of the acts complained of were disavowed by the German Government. On Jan. 8 Prince Bismarck telegraphed to the consul at Apia, reminding him of the agreement between the three Powers, according to which the annexation of Samoa was out of the question. In the same month President Cleveland announced to Congress that he had received a proposition from Germany of a Conference to be held at Berlin on the affairs of Samoa. Meanwhile the German representative at Apia had formally declared war against King Mataafa, and had placed Samoa, including foreign subjects, under martial law. These proceedings were promptly repudiated by the German Government, Count Arco Vallery, the German Minister at Washington, informing Mr. Bayard that Prince Bismarck was of opinion that his local agents had exceeded their authority, and that the German military commander in Samoa had been ordered to withdraw his proclamation concerning foreigners, while Dr. Knappe, the German consul, had been directed to give up the command of the administration of the island. It was not until March that Dr. Knappe was recalled from his post, and the German operations against Mataafa finally suspended. Meanwhile all attempts to induce Mataafa to surrender to the German authorities or to acknowledge their nominee, Tamasee, had ended in failure, the authority of the former increasing in importance as the latter became identified with the German and anti-patriotic party. On the night of March 16 a terrific hurricane broke over the Samoan islands, causing great loss of property and disaster to the foreign shipping. The German corvette *Olga* and the gunboats *Adler* and *Eber* were driven on the coral reef at Apia, and either wrecked or foundered. The United States' sloop *Nipsic* was run ashore to escape a worse fate, and the corvette *Vandalia* sank, with the loss of her captain, four officers

and forty men. The German loss in officers and men amounted to over eighty, but of the seven foreign war vessels in the harbour only one, H.M.S. *Calliope*, succeeded by a skilful and daring feat of seamanship in reaching the open sea and escaping shipwreck. The chief Mataafa sent a number of his men to help the struggling crews of the German ships, who rendered splendid service in the attempt to rescue the *Olya* from her fate.

By the middle of April the civil war in Samoa had virtually ceased, and King Mataafa's authority was fully re-established. An inquiry into the charges brought by the German authorities against the British Consul of having improperly assisted the natives during the recent fighting, was made by Sir J. B. Thurston, the British High Commissioner in the Pacific, and ended in the complete exoneration of the accused. In August Malietooa and the other exiled chiefs, who had been deported from the islands by the Germans, were brought back in the German gunboat *Wolf*. The natives received their old king with great enthusiasm, Mataafa being foremost in welcoming him back to Samoa. At the beginning of October a great assemblage of the people was held for the election of a king, all the foreign representatives being present. Malietooa made a speech in praise of Mataafa, proposing him as king, and declaring that he himself would be content to hold the place of vice-king. The Germans having declared their opposition to Mataafa, however, Malietooa was ultimately persuaded to accept the kingly dignity, being restored thereto with great rejoicings on Nov. 9, the representatives of the three Powers issuing proclamations recognising King Malietooa. This happy result, which concluded the long and troublesome Samoa difficulty, may be regarded as the chief practical outcome of the Berlin Conference, which, after a two months' sitting, came to a decision acknowledging the independence of the Samoa Islands, declaring the absolute neutrality of the three Powers, and binding them to abstain in the future from interference in the political concerns of the Samoans.

A few trifling accessions have been made in the year to the British dominion in Polynesia. The English flag has been hoisted in the Suwarrow Islands, lying about 450 miles east of Samoa, which consist of three low, wooded islands, and a few rocks surrounded by a coral reef, with an entrance for ships into an inner harbour. They are supposed to be useful to us with a view to future cable-laying operations. The report that England had annexed the Tubuai Islands has been the subject of communications between the two Governments of England and France. It proved to have no other foundation than the fact that the chiefs of two of the islands, Ravuta and Rimatara, had come to Rarotonga to pray the captain of H.M.S. *Hyacinth* to protect them.

The death of Father Damien, the courageous Belgian priest who devoted his life to the lepers of the Sandwich Islands, took place at Molokai on April 19.

THE PARNELL COMMISSION.

IN our historical survey of the year 1888, we chronicled the proceedings in Parliament with reference to the charges against Mr. Parnell and other Irish members, which were made in the course of the proceedings in *O'Donnell v. the Times*. We stated the explanation which Mr. Parnell gave as to the 100*l.* alleged to have been given by him to Frank Byrne, and the request which the leader of the Irish party made for a Committee. To this Mr. W. H. Smith replied with the offer of a Special Commission. The Bill constituting the Special Commission was introduced in the House of Commons, and after an acrimonious discussion it was passed. In the House of Lords, after the Duke of Argyll had moved a vote of confidence in the Irish policy of the Government, and Lord Herschell had criticised the Commission Bill and the treatment which had been accorded to Mr. Parnell and his supporters, the Bill was passed, and it received the Royal Assent on August 18, 1888. Three days before the Bill received the Royal Assent and checked the development of further legal proceedings, a writ was issued in an action brought by Mr. Parnell against the *Times*, in which the plaintiff claimed 100,000*l.* damages for the libels contained in the "forged letters." We may mention in passing that this action was settled on February 8, 1890, ten days before the Report of the Special Commission was issued. The *Times* paid Mr. Parnell 5,000*l.* and his costs. They also paid a small sum to Mr. Campbell, M.P., who, as secretary to Mr. Parnell, was involved in the charges contained in the "forged letters," and brought his action for damages at the same time as his leader.

The Special Commission Act, 1888 (51 and 52 Vict., c. 85), recited that "charges and allegations have been made against certain members of Parliament and other persons by the defendants in the course of the proceedings in an action entitled *O'Donnell v. Walter and another*," and set out the expediency of appointing a Special Commission to inquire into the truth of those charges and allegations, and of giving the Commission such powers as might be necessary for the effectual conduct of the inquiry.

The operative part of the Act appointed the Right Hon. Sir James Hannen, the Hon. Sir J. C. Day, and the Hon. Sir A. L. Smith, Commissioners for the purpose of the Act, charged with the duty of inquiring into and reporting upon the charges and allegations in question. For the purposes of the inquiry the Commissioners were given, in addition to certain special powers, all such powers, rights, and privileges as are vested in Her Majesty's High Court of Justice, or in any judge of that Court, on the occasion of any action.

As regards the parties implicated in the charges and allegations, their appearance at the inquiry with any person authorised by the Commissioners was to be allowed, and they might be represented by counsel or solicitor

practising in Great Britain or Ireland. And when any person affected by any of the charges and allegations was detained or imprisoned, the Commission might order their attendance on their own terms. To give false evidence before them was perjury with its penalties. No witness was to be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground of any privilege, or that the answer might tend to criminate him; but no evidence given by a witness was to be admissible in any foreign proceeding unless it were on a charge of perjury under the Act. Lastly, every witness who, in the judgment of the Commissioners, made full disclosure, was to be entitled to a certificate from the Commissioners to that effect; that certificate staying all proceedings against him in respect of any matter touching which he had been examined, save only proceedings for having given false evidence. Such was the Act under which the Commission was constituted.

In order to elucidate the Act, it is necessary to refer shortly to the "charges and allegations made by the defendants in the course of the proceedings in *O'Donnell v. Walter*." Of that action, which was heard on July 2-5, 1888, it is enough to say that the plaintiff withdrew from the jury all the alleged libels except two in which he had been specifically named, and on these two the jury found a verdict for the defendants. The *Times* said in effect that the charges made by them did not refer to Mr. O'Donnell. The plaintiff did not go into the box, and substantially his case broke down. But the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster), who, with Sir Henry James and others, represented the *Times*, in the course of a speech which lasted the greater part of three days, entered into a variety of matters to justify the publication in the *Times* of the articles upon "Parnellism and Crime." He claimed that the *Times* had dared to strip bare before the world one of the most "infamous organisations that ever tyrannised over an unfortunate country," and that for so doing it deserved the thanks of all right-thinking men. Read in the light of subsequent events, the words are interesting which the Attorney-General used, in compliance, no doubt, with his instructions. He said, "I am sure that the defendants will not go back from whatever they have said. I am sure it will not be said, whatever the result may be, that they have acted unfairly or dishonourably. It may or may not appear that they have been imposed upon; but they took the greatest possible pains to satisfy themselves about it. It was in their possession for months, and the most careful investigation was made into its genuineness, and every possible means were taken to investigate it—among others, that of comparison of handwriting." . . . And further, "Be the consequences what they may to the proprietors of the *Times*, they will lay before you the grounds upon which they believe the letters to be genuine, but they will not expose any of the persons from whom they may have received these documents; they will not expose any of them to that risk they know they would incur within a few hours of their names being known—of danger to their persons or to their lives. You" (the jury) "will not, therefore, hear from us from whom the *Times* had these documents. You will test them by every means in your power, and if you are satisfied that they are genuine, you will not care from whom they had them. The *Times* takes the responsibility of it."

The most important of the letters adduced by the *Times* must now be quoted. The first was addressed to Egan in Paris, and is in these terms.—

"9, 1, '82.

"Dear E.,—What are these fellows waiting for? This inaction is inex-

cusable. Our best men are in prison, and nothing is being done. Let there be an end of this hesitancy. Prompt action is called for. You undertook to make it hot for old Forster & Co. Let us have some evidence of your power to do so. My health is good—thanks.

“Yours very truly,
“CHAS. S. PARNELL.”

Though it cost the *Times* the verdict, said the Attorney-General, the *Times* would not state from whom they had that letter. Then came the letter which is universally known as the “fac-simile” letter, because it was so reproduced in the *Times*. It was not addressed, and ran as follows:—

“15, 5, '82.

“Dear Sir,—I am not surprised at your friend's anger, but he and you should know that to denounce the murders was the only course open to us. To do that promptly was plainly our best policy. But you can tell him and all others concerned, that though I regret the accident of Lord F. Cavendish's death, I cannot refuse to admit that Burke got no more than his deserts. You are at liberty to show him this, and others whom you can trust also, but let not my address be known. He can write to House of Commons.

“Yours very truly,
“CHAS. S. PARNELL.”

Then there were two letters, both dated June 16, 1882. The first was:—

“Dear Sir,—I am sure you will feel that I could not appear in Parliament in the face of this thing unless I condemned it. Our position there is always difficult to maintain; it would be untenable but for the course we took. That is the truth. I can say no more.

“Yours Very Truly,
“CHAS. S. PARNELL.”

The other was as follows:—

“Dear Sir,—I have always been anxious to have the good will of your friends, but why do they impugn my motives? I could not consent to the conditions they would impose, but I accept the entire responsibility for what we have done.

“Yours Very Truly,
“CHAS. S. PARNELL.”

It is impossible to give more in these pages than the general nature of the charges brought by the *Times* against Mr. Parnell and his adherents. Of the facsimile letters and the article accompanying it, the Attorney-General said that they contained gross accusations against Mr. Parnell—“without doubt, if untrue, the worst libel ever published upon a public man.” One or two passages may be quoted in illustration of the propositions put forward by the *Times* that the leaders of the Land League, afterwards the National League, were guilty of complicity with crime. “All the information now laid before the public in a compact form, upon the unimpeachable authority of the conspirators themselves, goes to enforce the lesson of the New Departure and the previous revelations of the connexion between Parnellism and Crime. The whole conspiracy, whether carried on by mealy-mouthed gentlemen who sit at London dinner tables, or by the fiends who organise arson and murder, is one and indivisible. It is paid out of the same purse, it is

worked by the same men, it is directed to the same ends, it is inspired by one universal spirit of hatred to this country, and determination, if possible, to bring about complete separation. Whether the money goes to pay supporters of Mr. Gladstone in Parliament, or to equip desperadoes for outrage in English towns, is a mere matter of tactics." And again, "We have publicly stated, and we repeat the statement, that the present allies of the Gladstonians, the men whom Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues are assisting to paralyse law and to render government impossible in Ireland, have been, and are, associated, closely and continuously, with the worst of criminals, with the agents and instruments of murder conspiracies, with the planners and paymasters of cowardly and inhuman outrage, with the preachers of the 'gospel of dynamite,' who are at the same time the financiers that furnish the funds on which the 'Parliamentary party' subsist." Once more, "The charge was that the Land League chiefs based their movement on a scheme of assassination carefully calculated and applied," and "murderers provide the funds, murderers have their inmost counsels. Murderers have gone forth from the Land League offices to set their bloody work afoot, and have presently returned to consult their constitutional leaders." We will conclude these extracts from the *Times'* articles with the passage which is quoted by the Commissioners: "In times not yet remote, Mr. Parnell and his supporters would assuredly have been impeached for one tithe of their avowed defiance of the law, and in ages yet more robustly conscious of the differences between evil and good their heads would have decorated the city gates." In fact, as Lord Coleridge, the Lord Chief Justice, said in his summing up, the *Times* accused the Parnellite party of abominable crime. The charges "run over some sixty pages, and contain a great variety of statements deeply incriminating a large number of persons—members of Parliament and persons who are not members of Parliament, but are well known to the world as honourable men. They are accused, frankly and plainly, of abominable crime—not so much perhaps of having been guilty by their own hands, but of having lent themselves to a system which must necessarily be accompanied with crime, and of having general knowledge of many of the crimes which did accompany it." This was the substance of the charge, in illustration of which we have only been able to quote the four letters alleged to have been written and signed by Mr. Parnell, and the three extracts from "Parnellism and Crime" which are given above. The *Times* declared itself fully prepared to justify the statements made against the real members of the Parnellite party.

The Commissioners held a preliminary sitting on September 17, 1888, at which they announced their intention of conducting the inquiry judicially, and according to the rules of evidence and procedure prevailing in the ordinary Courts of Justice. Accordingly, they required the accusers, who were the defendants in the action of *O'Donnell v. Walter*, to give particulars, first, of the persons against whom they brought their charges; secondly, of the charges which they intended to make, and proposed to substantiate. The members incriminated, or the respondents, were sixty-five in number, and all appeared, as did Mr. Michael Davitt. Nearly all were represented by solicitor and counsel. Only Mr. Biggar, Mr. T. Healy, and Mr. Davitt conducted their cases in person. The counsel were as follows:—For the defendants in *O'Donnell v. Walter*, the Attorney-General (Sir R. E. Webster, Q.C., M.P.), Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Murphy, Q.C., Mr. John Atkinson, Q.C., Mr. William Graham, Mr. Ronan (who became a Q.C. during the progress of the inquiry),

and Mr. G. R. Askwith, who was retained late in the proceedings. The counsel for Mr. Parnell were Sir Charles Russell, Q.C., M.P., and Mr. Asquith, M.P. Mr. R. T. Reid, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Edward Harrington, M.P., and Mr. Arthur Russell represented thirty-one of the incriminated members; Mr. F. Lockwood, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Lionel Hart, and Mr. Arthur O'Connor represented the remaining thirty of the incriminated members.

The inquiry began on October 22, 1888, and the sittings terminated on November 22, 1889, having occupied 128 working days. The Report of the Commissioners is dated, as has been said, February 18, 1890. The opening speech of the Attorney-General occupied five days. It was concerned with the intimate connexion which existed between Mr. Parnell and his friends on the one hand, and the extremists of the dynamite section in the United States, and to the large subsidies received from America; with the crime and outrage which had followed the delivery of Nationalist speeches in Ireland; and with the letters incriminating Mr. Parnell, the whole story of which the Attorney-General promised to lay before the Court.

Of the enormous mass of evidence which was adduced by the *Times* it is impossible, in the space at our disposal, to give more than the dry bones. We shall content ourselves with quoting a few of the most graphic and important passages by which the proceedings of the Commission will live in the memories of the present generation. Day after day, until the *dénouement* of the "forged letters," the Probate Court was crowded, and every inch of room was occupied. For the great majority of the evidence to which we are unable to refer, a fair estimate of its importance can be gained by observing the weight attributed to it by the judges in their Report.

The most remarkable witness called by the Attorney-General to prove his case was unquestionably Major Le Caron, an Englishman, who was baptized as Thomas Winters Beach, and served with the Northerners in the American war. He joined the Fenian movement, and later the "V. O." or "Clan-na-Gael," and for many years communicated their revolutionary counsels to the British Government. His story was that in April 1881, he came to Europe with introductions from Devoy to Egan and O'Leary in Paris; that he then came to London with Egan, and was introduced to Mr. Parnell as "one of our friends from America," the interview only lasting a minute or two; that he and Egan then returned to Paris, when Egan told him that Mr. Parnell wished to see him again before he returned to the States; that he went back to London, and had an interview with Mr. J. J. O'Kelly and Mr. Parnell at the House of Commons. The details of their conversation are best told in Le Caron's own words, as he was examined by the Attorney-General.

Q. How long after you got back did Egan tell you that Mr. Parnell wanted to see you before you left finally for America?

A. I think it occurred a very short time before I left the second time, probably only one or two days. The latter part of my visit at that time.

Q. You came back to London?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr. Egan come with you or not on the second occasion of your coming from Paris?

A. No, not on the second occasion.

Q. Did you go down to the House of Commons to see Mr. Parnell?

A. Not specially to see that gentleman; to see all I could see.

Q. Who went with you on the occasion of your seeing Mr. Parnell?

A. The night I have now made reference to I think I went alone.

Q. Had you, before the night to which you refer, seen Mr. Parnell on the occasion of your return to London the second time, or not until you saw him on this night?

A. I had seen him merely to salute him. I had no conversation with him until this night.

Q. On the night on which you had a conversation with him are you able to fix the time in any way?

A. Not at this time without notes.

Q. Who did you see on that same night, if anybody, besides Mr. Parnell?

A. I spent some little time with Mr. O'Kelly. We had a little refreshment at the stand in the lobby, and we had some conversation together.

Q. Anything of importance?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Well mention it, please.

A. He was denouncing in most bitter terms——

Q. (The President): Who was?

A. Mr. J. J. O'Kelly—in most bitter terms the attitude of the organisation towards Mr. Parnell, himself and party, and he thought something should be done, and could be done, by us on the other side to bring them into line. He denounced Mr. John O'Leary, our agent, as an old fossil. I believe I told him Mr. O'Leary had denounced him for deserting the cause, and getting into Parliament instead, betraying the interests of the organisation as their agent. During the conversation with Mr. O'Kelly, I think there was a division in the House, and the lobby was very full, and talking to other members, Mr. Parnell came up into the group and at once recognised me, and we saluted each other. I think we shook hands. Some few words passed between us, and he tapped me on the shoulder and said, "I want to see you," quietly saying that, and he beckoned to O'Kelly. Myself and Mr. O'Kelly went through the door from the inner lobby, passing down the corridor running to the library. I remember we were passing the doors of the library, and then we went down a corridor running in a left-hand direction from the library, and we slowly promenaded up and down, and took another corridor, which ran still on an angle to the left.

Q. (The Attorney-General): I do not want to interrupt you, but I want to ask first, can you say whether anything passed that Mr. O'Kelly and Mr. Parnell were parties to?

A. Yes; Mr. O'Kelly, as soon as we were in a retired portion of the corridor, resumed the same subject of conversation that had occurred between myself and Mr. O'Kelly previous to the approach of Mr. Parnell. That was the subject resumed.

Q. Do you remember, did he say anything beyond what you have said just now about his denouncing the people for opposing him or not?

A. That was the substance.

Q. If Mr. O'Kelly said anything fresh before you talked to Mr. Parnell alone, I want to get it.

(Sir C. Russell): He has not said anything about talking to Mr. Parnell alone yet.

(The Attorney-General): Pardon me, I asked him first to confine himself to the conversation when they were both present. Did O'Kelly say anything more, except what you have referred to, up to the time you talked to Mr. Parnell alone?

(Sir C. Russell): He has not said anything about talking with Mr. Parnell alone. I would rather my friend would not suggest to him.

(The President): No, he has not said that.

(The Attorney-General): Did you have a conversation with Mr. Parnell alone that evening?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr. O'Kelly say anything else before you had a conversation with him?

A. Yes.

Q. What?

A. He suggested that on my return I should use my influence with my friends on the other side to bring about a little coercion on their part, to bring the organisation into line on that side of the water. That we were all working for one common object, therefore there should and need be no misunderstanding.

Q. I want you just to explain what he said about bringing things into line. What two organisations?

A. The open movement on this side, and the I. R. B.

Q. By the open movement you mean the Land League, and by the I. R. B. you mean the Irish Republican Brotherhood?

A. Yes.

Q. After Mr. O'Kelly left, will you tell me as nearly as you can what Mr. Parnell said to you?

A. On Mr. O'Kelly leaving—

Q. One other question, did O'Kelly say how you were to bring coercion to bear upon them?

A. No, sir.

Q. After O'Kelly left, what did Mr. Parnell say?

A. He continued the same line of conversation that Mr. O'Kelly had introduced. He said that the whole matter laid in our hands, "You furnish the sinews of war; you have them in your power; if they do not do as you tell them, stop the supplies; the whole matter rests in your hands."

Q. Did he mention any name as to any person who should promote this bringing into line or closer alliance?

A. Yes.

Q. Who?

A. He expressly wished that as soon as I returned to New York I should at once see John Devoy, and should say to John Devoy, from Mr. Parnell, he believing, as he stated, that John Devoy could do more than any one man in the organisation to bring about an understanding such as he desired, enough to secure his presence as soon as possible on this side of the water, Mr. Parnell agreeing to meet him in Paris on his arriving there, it not being advisable for Devoy to come to this side.

Q. Did Mr. Parnell say that?

A. He did not, sir; he simply suggested coming to Paris, and stopped.

Q. What else?

A. He also stated, in reference to Devoy's visit, that so far as his expenses were concerned, I could guarantee on his part that he would defray them.

Q. Did he say anything about Alexander Sullivan?

A. Yes; he also requested me to see Alexander Sullivan on my return home, and mentioned also Dr. William Carroll, of Philadelphia. He also mentioned the name of William J. Hynes, and asked me to see those four by name.

Q. Did he tell you what you were to see those for as well? I want to know in what connexion he mentioned those three names, Sullivan, Hynes, and Dr. Carroll's, as well as Devoy's.

A. He desired me to lay before them the situation, and to show them the necessity for bringing about a thorough understanding, and if Devoy would not or could not come, to get one of the others, Hynes or Sullivan, not Dr. Carroll. He was aware of the fact, from what he said, that Dr. Carroll was opposing the open movement—was not a friend to the open movement.

Q. And he wanted to get Sullivan and Hynes to come over if Devoy could not?

A. Yes; he said, "There need be no misunderstanding; we are working for a common purpose—for the independence of Ireland—just the same as you are working for." He said, "Doctor, I have long since ceased to believe that anything but the force of arms will ever bring about the redemption of Ireland."

Q. Did he know you as doctor?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr. Parnell address you as doctor?

A. Yes, I was introduced to him as Dr. Le Caron.

Q. You have said already to my lord that you practised medicine—took your degree as a doctor of medicine, and practised as a doctor?

A. I did, periodically, for some time.

Q. Now, Mr. Parnell mentioned these gentlemen, and expressed his wish to you in the words you have described to endeavour to bring them in line. Was there any other revolutionary organisation that you knew these men to be connected with in America except the V.C. and U.B.?

A. The organisation that I represented was the only one that they did belong to; there was another organisation in embryo at this time.

Q. Do you remember whether Mr. Parnell used any word when describing this organisation?

A. No, sir.

Q. He simply referred to it as a matter which you would understand at once?

A. Yes.

Q. Neither V.C. nor U.B. or Clan-na-Gael were mentioned by name?

A. No.

Q. Treated as a matter that was understood?

A. As if understood.

Q. Now, did Mr. Parnell give you anything?

A. He gave me a number of other details of his views.

Q. I made a mistake. You say he gave you other details of his views. As near as you can tell, was there anything Mr. Parnell said on that occasion beyond what you have already stated?

A. In reference to his views as a revolutionist he told me that he did not see any reason why, when we were prepared, had sufficient money, were armed and organised, a successful insurrectionary movement could not be inaugurated in Ireland. He said, "I think from the outlook that we will, at the end of the year, get in the Land League treasury a sum of 100,000 dollars. That is a pretty good nucleus. You folks ought to do as well as that." He entered slightly into the question of the time, of the number of men slightly, and the amount of money required.

It will be convenient to quote in this place the remarks made by the commissioners upon this important conversation. Mr. Parnell in his evi-

dence did not deny a conversation with Le Caron; he said that he might have had an interview with him, but he had no recollection of it, and thought it most improbable. Mr. Parnell stated that he never sent any message either to the Clan-na-Gael or to any other persons mentioned by Le Caron, and that he neither directly nor indirectly communicated with any of these persons for the purpose suggested by Le Caron. And Mr. Parnell disavowed the statement that he had dared to believe that anything but the force of arms would bring about the redemption of Ireland, because, he said, he never thought so. Mr. O'Kelly could not say whether the conversation between him and Le Caron did or did not take place, but stated that he had not the slightest remembrance of it. In corroboration of his statement Le Caron produced a letter from Devoy to himself, showing that Devoy had been told that his assistance was wanted to remove some dissatisfaction which had arisen in the revolutionary party in America as to Irish affairs. Upon this subject the Judges couple the probabilities of the case with Le Caron's evidence, as confirmed by Devoy's letter, and they come to the conclusion that Le Caron gave a correct account of the message which he was requested by Mr. Parnell to convey to Devoy. They add that it is not impossible that in conversation with a supposed revolutionist Mr. Parnell may have expressed himself so as to leave the impression that he agreed with his interlocutor.

It is hardly too much to say that the strength of the *Times* case was in Le Caron, as its weakness was in Pigott. It was on Pigott alone that all the "forged letters" depended; it was from him, through Houston, that the *Times* had procured them, and he completely broke down in cross-examination by Sir Charles Russell. He was asked to write various words, and he mis-spelt "likehood" and "hesitency" just as they were mis-spelt in the "forged letters." When tried with letters which he had written to Archbishop Walsh, he prevaricated and denied any recollection of the correspondence, though he acknowledged having written some of the letters in that correspondence, while he pretended ignorance of the meaning of many passages. Perhaps the following passage from his cross-examination is as illustrative as any. Pigott had written several letters to Archbishop Walsh, endeavouring to communicate with him under the seal of the confessional, and had tried to disclose that the notorious letters were forgeries. This correspondence had come into the hands of Sir Charles Russell, who cross-examined Pigott thereon:—

Q. Is that your letter? do not trouble to read it; tell me if it is your letter. (*Same was handed witness.*) Do not trouble to read it.

A. Yes, I think it is.

Q. Have you any doubt of it?

A. No.

My lords, it is from Anderton's Hotel, and it is addressed by the witness to Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin. The date, my Lord, is March 4, 1887, three days before the first appearance of the first series of the articles "Parnellism and Crime."

"Private and confidential.

"Anderton's Hotel, Fleet Street, London,
"March 4, 1887.

"My Lord,—The importance of the matter about which I write will doubtless excuse this intrusion on your Grace's attention. Briefly, I wish to say that I have been made aware of the details of certain proceedings that are in preparation with the object of destroying the influence of the Parnellites party in Parliament."

Q. What were the certain proceedings that were in preparation ?

A. I do not recollect.

Q. Turn to my Lords and repeat that answer.

A. I do not recollect.

Q. You swear that, writing on March 4 stating that you have been made aware of the details of certain proceedings that are in preparation, with the object of destroying the influence of the Parnellite party in Parliament, less than two years ago ?

A. Yes.

Q. You do not know what that referred to ?

A. I do not, really.

Q. May I suggest to you ?

A. Yes, you may.

Q. Did it refer to the incriminatory letter among other things ?

A. Oh, at that date. No, the letters had not been obtained, I think, at that date, had they—two years ago ?

Q. I do not want to confuse you at all, Mr. Pigott. Would you mind giving me the date of that letter ? March 4, 1887 ?

A. March 4, 1887.

Q. Is it your impression the letters had not been obtained at that date ?

A. Oh, yes, some of the letters had been obtained before that date.

Q. Then reminding you that some of the letters had been obtained before that date, did that passage that I have read to you in that letter refer to these letters amongst other things ?

A. No, I rather fancy they had reference to the forthcoming articles in the *Times*.

Q. I thought you told us you did not know anything about the forthcoming articles ?

A. Yes, I did. I find now I am mistaken—that I must have heard something about them.

Q. Then pray try and not make the same mistake again, Mr. Pigott. Now, you go on—

“I cannot enter more fully into details than to state that the proceedings referred to consist in the publication of certain statements purporting to prove the complicity of Mr. Parnell himself and some of his supporters with murders and outrages in Ireland, to be followed, in all probability, by the institution of criminal proceedings against these parties by the Government.”

Who told you that ?

A. I have no idea.

Q. But that refers amongst others to the incriminatory letters ?

A. I do not recollect that it did.

Q. Do you swear it did not ?

A. I will not swear it did not.

Q. Do you think it did ?

A. No, I do not think it did.

Q. Do you think that these letters, if genuine, would prove, or would not prove, Mr. Parnell's complicity in crime ?

A. I thought they would be very likely to prove it.

Q. And the same to Mr. Egan ?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, reminding you of that opinion, I ask you whether you did not intend to refer, not solely I suggest, but amongst other things, to the letters.

as being the matter which would prove complicity, or purport to prove complicity ?

A. Yes, I may have had that in my mind.

Q. You could hardly have had any doubt that you had ?

A. I suppose so.

Q. You suppose you may have had ?

A. Yes.

Q. There is the letter and the statement :—

“ Your Grace may be assured that I speak with full knowledge and am in a position to prove beyond all doubt and question the truth of what I say.”

Was that true ?

A. It could hardly be true.

Q. It could hardly be true ?

A. Yes.

Q. Then did you write that which was false ?

A. I suppose it was in order to give strength to what I had said.

Q. You thought—— ?

A. I do not think it was warranted by what I knew.

Q. You did not think it was warranted by what you knew ? . . .

A. No.

Q. But you added the untrue statement in order to add truth to what you had said ?

A. Yes.

Q. Designedly an untrue statement ?

A. No, I do not think it was actually untrue.

Q. What ?

A. Not designedly.

Q. Accidentally ?

A. Perhaps so.

Q. You believe these letters to be genuine ?

A. I do.

Q. And did at this time ?

A. Yes.

Q. “ And I will further assure your Grace that I am also able to point out how these designs may be successfully combated and finally defeated.”

How, if these documents were genuine documents, and you believed them to be such—how were you able to assure his Grace that you were able to point out how the design might be successfully combated and finally defeated ?

A. Well, as I say, I had not the letters actually in my mind at that time ; as far as I can gather I do not recollect that letter at all. My memory is really a blank as to the circumstance.

Q. You told me a moment ago, after great deliberation and consideration, you had both in your mind ?

A. I said it was probable I did, but, as I say, the thing has completely faded out of my mind. I have no recollection of that at all.

Q. That I can understand.

A. I have not the faintest idea of what I referred to particularly.

Q. I must press you. Assuming the letters to be genuine, what were the means by which you were able to assure his Grace that you could point out how the design might be successfully combated and finally defeated ?

A. I cannot conceive, really.

Q. Oh, try. You really must try.

A. I cannot.

Q. Supposing, for instance, you could point to another, that the letters had been concocted, I presume you would say that would be a mode in which—?

A. As I say, I do not think that letter refers to the letters at all.

Q. You know, you have more than once told me it did.

A. I can only give you my opinion. As I say, I have no recollection.

Q. We will drop the letters for an instant, and come back to them. What were the means by which you were able to point out how the design might be successfully combated and finally defeated?

A. I do not know.

Q. You must think, please; it is not two years ago. Mr. Pigott, had you qualms of conscience at that time, and were you afraid of the consequences of what you had done?

A. Not at all.

Q. Then what do you mean?

A. I cannot tell you, really.

Q. Try.

A. I cannot.

Q. Try.

A. It is no use.

Q. May I take it, then, your answer to my Lords is that you cannot give any explanation?

A. I really cannot, absolutely.

Q. Of what you meant by this?

A. No.

(Continuing reading)—

Q. "I assure your Grace that I have no other motive except to respectfully suggest that your Grace would communicate the substance of what I state to some one or other of the parties concerned."

Who are they?

A. To some one or other of the parties concerned, I suppose—some of the leading Parnellites.

Q. Very well.

A. I suppose so.

Q. "On, however, the specific understanding that my name will be kept secret, to whom I could furnish details."

Attend to the next expression.

A. Yes.

Q. "Exhibit proofs, and suggest how the coming blow may be effectively met."

What do you say to that, Mr. Pigott?

A. I have nothing to say, except that I do not recollect anything about it absolutely.

Q. What was "the coming blow"?

A. I suppose the coming publication.

Q. How was it to be effectively met?

A. I have not the slightest idea.

Q. Assuming the letters to be genuine, does it even now occur to your mind how it would be effectively met?

A. No.

Q. "For reasons which no doubt your Grace will have no difficulty in discovering, I could not apply to any of the parties direct, and that is why I venture to ask your Grace's interference."

Why could you not apply to the parties direct?

A. Because I was not in good odour with them—because I opposed them.

Q. Because you were not in good odour with them, and you had quarrelled with them?

A. Yes.

Q. "At the same time, I know that in adopting this course I run the risk of incurring your Grace's displeasure; but perhaps the deep interest which your Grace is known to take in the preservation of the integrity of the party that is so seriously threatened will plead my excuse. Moreover, I am forced to beg your Grace's assistance from the strong conviction"—(I want your attention)—"in my mind, founded on what I have learned of the evidence relied on, which is *prima facie* serious, that the proceedings, unless met in the way I can suggest, will succeed in their object."

What did you mean by that?

A. I have no recollection.

Q. What?

A. I have no notion—I do not know.

Q. Mr. Pigott, you are face to face with my Lords.

A. I say that my memory is a perfect blank as regards that letter. I have not the slightest recollection of having written it.

Q. But you did recollect, you know, because you told us so, that you had a correspondence with Dr. Walsh.

A. That is not the correspondence I referred to at all.

Q. What was the correspondence you referred to?

A. The correspondence referred to the publication of the first letter.

Q. This is three days before the publication of the first letter.

The Attorney-General: No; it was in April.

Sir Charles Russell: We will come on in time, Mr. Pigott.

A. I have no recollection of that correspondence whatever. I do not know what it was all about, or what was in my mind about it.

Q. I really must press you. First of all you say that the conviction in your mind, founded on what you have learned, and the evidence relied upon, "is *prima facie* serious, and that the proceedings, unless met in the way I can suggest, will succeed in their object."

A. I cannot suggest anything at all. As I say, I cannot recollect anything whatever about it. If you would read the Archbishop's reply, perhaps it will bring something to my mind.

Q. I will ask you first, will you give me the original?

A. Is that letter marked "private and confidential"?

Q. Certainly; I have read so. "In any case, however, I trust your Grace will regard this letter as quite private and confidential, except in so far as it may be used or referred to in furtherance of the motive with which it is sent." That was—"the motive with which it is sent" was—to explain and to enable to be met the threatened charge which was *prima facie* serious, but which you alone could suggest a mode of effectually meeting. Now, Mr. Pigott, pull yourself together, and let us know about this.

A. I really do not know a single thing about it.

It only remains to add that Pigott submitted himself to the fire of this searching cross-examination on a Thursday afternoon, February 21. He

continued in the box all Friday, and on that day the Court adjourned till the following Tuesday. On that morning he was called, and it was discovered that he had fled to Madrid. There on March 5 the unhappy man committed suicide just as he was falling into the hands of the police. Meanwhile the Attorney-General, on behalf of the *Times*, withdrew the letters "with the full acknowledgment that after the evidence which has been given, we are not entitled to say that they are genuine." He then expressed sincere regret, on behalf of those for whom he appeared, that the letters were published, "and no doubt that feeling, most truly felt, will at the proper time be further and more fully expressed by themselves."

After the dramatic scenes connected with the forged letters, public interest in the proceedings of the Commission waned. The evidence on the articles written in the *Irish World* was voluminous, and the accounts of remittances from America were intricate. Interest, however, revived when Sir Charles Russell opened the case for Mr. Parnell and his supporters in a speech of great power, which lasted for the greater part of seven days. The speech was, in the main, a survey of the history of Ireland from the time of the Act of Union. Sir Charles Russell contended that the real root of the Irish difficulty was to be found in the antagonism always shown by the landlord class to the people among whom they lived and the jealousy of Irish industries long evinced by the British Parliament. From these causes and from recurrent distress had sprung secret societies and crime. The *Clan-na-Gael* in America, the "rump of the old Fenian Party," were playing at conspiracies, and Mr. Parnell had kept the movement in Ireland free from the dangerous associations with the Physical Force section in the United States and in Ireland. From 1879 onwards a great revolution had been going on in the country, which had been assisted by the Land Acts of 1870 and of 1887. We cannot do any measure of justice to Sir Charles Russell's eloquent speech, but we will quote a few lines from the peroration which have attracted a large share of attention. He said: "I have spoken not merely as an advocate. I have spoken for the land of my birth. But I feel, and profoundly feel, that I have been speaking for and in the best interests of England also, where my years of laborious life have been passed, and where I have received kindness, consideration, and regard, which I shall be glad to make some attempt to repay. My Lords, my colleagues and myself have had a responsible duty. We have had to defend not merely the leaders of a nation, but the nation itself—to defend the leaders of a nation whom it was sought to crush; to defend a nation whose hopes it was sought to dash to the ground. This inquiry, intended as a curse, has proved a blessing. Designed, prominently designed, to ruin one man, it has been his vindication. In opening this case I said we represented the accused. My Lords, I claim leave to say that to-day the positions are reversed. We are the accusers; the accused are there" (pointing to the *Times* advisers). "I hope—I believe—that this inquiry in its present stage has served, and in its future development will serve, more purposes even than the vindication of individuals. It will remove baneful misconceptions as to the character, the actions, the motives, the aims of the Irish people, and of the leaders of the Irish people. It will set earnest minds—thank God there are many earnest and honest minds in this land—thinking for themselves upon this question. It will soften ancient prejudices. It will hasten the day of true union, and of real reconciliation between the people of Ireland and the people of Great Britain; and with the advent of that union and reconciliation will be dispelled, and

dispelled for ever, the cloud—the weighty cloud—that has long rested on the history of a noble race, and dimmed the glory of a mighty empire.”

It is an open secret that on the conclusion of this speech Sir James Hannen passed down a slip of paper to Sir Charles Russell, on which were the words: “A great speech, worthy of a great occasion.” Seeing it, the Attorney-General said to his opponent, “So we all think.” The first witness called on behalf of the respondents was Mr. Parnell. His examination lasted for six days at first, and one day later, and it ranged over a wide field of inquiry. We have only space to touch upon two points which have arrested the public eye. The first is concerned with the *Irishman* newspaper, which was purchased from the notorious Pigott by Mr. Parnell and others in 1881. Mr. Parnell stated in the box that the *Irishman* was “purchased because it was a very serious impediment to the movement of the National League, acting in most disreputable ways, as we knew.” The editorial notice upon the change of proprietorship contained these words: “The *Irishman* has changed hands, but not minds. The history of its past is the programme of its future. Thrice in its career a transfer of management has taken place, but not once has it swerved from the great principles for the advocacy of which it was first established. As there has not been, so there shall not be, any change in its spirit.” Again, Mr. Parnell stated that he did not know that the *Irishman* newspaper was being carried on as long as it in fact was; that he thought it would have ceased to exist about the end of 1882. The paper was, in fact, continued down to August 1885, though it never paid its expenses. “We kept it going,” said Mr. Parnell, “at a loss.” We may anticipate a little, and quote the judges upon this topic. They drew the inference from Mr. Parnell’s purchase of the *Irishman*, coupled with the manner in which it was conducted until its extinction in August 1885, that Mr. Parnell’s object was to address his Fenian supporters through that medium, while *United Ireland* was more particularly a medium of the Land League organisation. The other matter in Mr. Parnell’s evidence to which we must refer is contained in small compass. On January 27, 1881, Mr. Parnell stated in the House of Commons that secret conspiracies had then ceased to exist in Ireland. When these words were put to him in the witness-box by the Attorney-General, he remembered, but could not exactly say without reading the context of that speech, what his view was in urging that argument, “but it is possible he was endeavouring to mislead the House on the occasion.”

Q. “Do you mean, sir, it is possible you were endeavouring to mislead the House on that occasion?”

A. “In order to cut the ground from under the argument of the Government in support of the Bill.”

Upon this point the Commissioners’ finding is that Mr. Parnell was alluding in the House of Commons to secret societies other than that of the Fenian conspiracy, and that he was accurate when he made that statement.

Mr. Parnell was followed by a very large number of witnesses, who, beginning with Archbishop Walsh, came to prove that, speaking generally, distress, and not agitation, was the cause of crime. Many of these witnesses were severely cross-examined and shaken by the Attorney-General and Sir Henry James. Further evidence was then taken from Mr. Soames, the solicitor for the *Times*, and Mr. Houston, the secretary of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic League, as to the payments made to *Times* witnesses and to Pigott. This led to the withdrawal from the case of the respondents’ counsel. When a

desire was expressed by Sir Charles Russell to see the books of Mr. Houston's association, they were denied him by the judges as irrelevant, and upon this all the counsel who appeared for the persons charged withdrew from the Court on July 16, 1889. In their absence the case proceeded, and the number of witnesses called on both sides amounted, it is computed, to 500. At last, on November 22, Sir Henry James concluded his exhaustive reply on behalf of the *Times*. His speech lasted for twelve days, and was a masterly summing-up of the *quantum* proved by the *Times*. We shall find much of it echoed in the Report. We can only quote a few words from Sir Henry James's peroration. He claimed to have placed before the Court, "in some sort of sequence, a history of ten years, a sad history to belong to any people. It has been a history full of crime, springing from hasty assumption of power by men who have inaptly used it. My Lords, I say it is a period of shame, and sad shame, and it is a period that surely Irishmen—patriotic Irishmen—must now be, and ever will be, bitterly regretting. Ireland has had dark and bitter days in her past. There are times when her brave men have fought in the open field, have fallen, and have failed. Her statesmen, her eloquent statesmen, have been silent within sadness as in the days when, we are told—

‘Grattan and Charlemont wept with her sorrow.’

But I know not that ever till now Irishmen have had cause to be ashamed of the history of their country. My Lords, it is said that happy is the country that has no history. So it may be, and this I know, if men doubt the application of that trite statement to Ireland, that happy would it have been for a people, happy would it have been for those who acted, and for those who suffered, if the events of the last ten years could be blotted out. No human hand can do so. The annihilation of events is impossible, and all that remains to do is, that faithful records shall be made of the acts of that time. Such will be your duty. It may be—it doubtless will be—that all who have taken part in this inquiry, from you, my Lords, to the humblest officer of this Court, will receive some condemnation, some attack, and some obloquy. But let that pass. The result will repay; for the truth being told, it must be that a people, stirred by an awakened conscience, will be aroused from the dreams of a long night, and when awake they will despise their dreams; they will seek new modes of action, with true men to guide them, and then it will be—God grant it may be—that blessings will be poured upon a happy and contented people."

With this speech, and with a few words from Sir James Hannen, the public sittings of the Special Commission came to an end. It was necessarily almost three months before the Report was presented to Parliament.

The charges formulated in the particulars are summarised in the Report, and it will be convenient to follow the main lines there laid down. The Report deals with these charges *seriatim* and at very considerable length, the whole Blue Book extending, it may be observed, to some 160 pages. These nine charges, with the conclusions at which the Commissioners arrived upon each charge, shall be enumerated together at the end of this chapter.

The first charge was "that the respondents were members of a conspiracy and organisation having for its ultimate object to establish the absolute independence of Ireland." Dealing with this charge, the Judges began their inquiry with the year 1877. They refused to consider, as Sir Charles Russell invited them to do, the political history of Ireland for the last century. In

1877 the mantle of Mr. Butt fell upon the shoulders of Mr. Parnell, and he was virtually leader of the Home Rule Party. The Fenian movement was represented by the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland, and by the United Brotherhood or Clan-na-Gael in America. Each of these organisations had for its object the separation of Ireland from England by insurrection. The Clan-na-Gael in America and the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland were, says the Report, "parts of one and the same conspiracy, its members being interchangeable by a system of transfer." When in 1877 Michael Davitt was released from Dartmoor, he immediately rejoined the Irish organisation, and in the following year he went to the United States, his purpose being to realise the plan which he had formed while in prison of making the land question in Ireland a stepping-stone to national independence. He did a great deal to bring the Irish Nationalists of America into accord with Mr. Parnell and his policy. Shortly stated, the basis upon which this alliance was framed was the vigorous agitation of the land question, with a view to obtaining self-government. This is known as the "New Departure." Davitt formed a close alliance with the Devoy section of the Clan-na-Gael, which, while approving of insurrection where practicable, sought to make some social question, such as that of the land, the means of attaining to Irish independence. From the other, or the Carroll, section of the Clan-na-Gael, who were for insurrection pure and simple, he endeavoured to gain recruits. It was with these forces behind it that the Land League was formed in 1879. Its avowed objects were, first, to bring about a reduction of rack-rents; second, to facilitate the obtaining of the ownership of the soil by the occupiers of the soil. In Ireland this agrarian movement originated with the Irishtown meeting of April 20, 1879, and Mr. Parnell first appeared on the same platform with Davitt at the Westport meeting two months later. The principles upon which the Land League was founded were thus stated by Davitt: "I maintain that it was the complete destruction of Irish landlordism: first, as the system which was responsible for the poverty and periodical famines which have decimated Ireland; and secondly, because landlordism was a British garrison, which barred the way to national independence." Of the seven first chosen officers of the League, four—namely, Messrs. Biggar, Egan, Davitt, and Brennan—were, or had been, members of the Fenian organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Some of the Committee aimed at a complete separation of Ireland from England, and at the establishment of an Irish Republic; some desired that a federal connexion should be established between those portions of the United Kingdom; while others looked only to the amelioration of the condition of the tenant farmers of Ireland by the reduction of rents, and the acquisition by them of the ownership of the soil.

The Land League founded, Mr. Parnell was asked to go to America to obtain assistance. This he did about Christmas 1879, and was warmly received by all sections of the Irish party in the United States. The language which he used in his speeches became stronger as he went on. At Cincinnati he used a phrase which has since become famous. "None of us, whether we are in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England." The American Land League was founded, and Mr. Parnell returned to England for the General Election of 1880. He was received at a banquet at Cork, at which Mr. Biggar said that "he could not believe that the Irish race was as badly off as the Russian race. They had all seen what Hartmann had done,

and, if the present constitutional course that they were pursuing in Parliament did not succeed in getting the rights they wanted for Ireland, he thought that Ireland would be able to produce another Hartmann, probably with a much better result." One more quotation, this one being from a speech delivered by Mr. Parnell at the Rotunda, Dublin, on April 30, 1880. He said, "The Americans sent me back with this message—that for the future you must not expect one cent for charity, but millions to break the land system. And now, before I go, I will tell you a little incident that happened at one of our meetings in America. A gentleman came on the platform and handed me twenty-five dollars, and said, 'Here is five dollars for bread and twenty dollars for lead.'"

Meanwhile, during Mr. Parnell's absence in the United States, the business of the organisation had been actively conducted by Davitt, Egan, and Brennan. Speeches were delivered in many parts of the country, and the organisation was most actively promoted. The Land League rose rapidly into the position of a living and a most powerful force. The object kept in view "was not to win over the Fenians from their illegal and insurrectionary courses to a constitutional policy, but to retain their assistance by making it clear that the Land League leaders did not condemn their flagrantly illegal acts, and by the avowal made by Mr. Dillon that he sympathised with them." In the same year 1880 Davitt went out a second time to the United States, and the principle upon which all his speeches were founded was the expediency of uniting the land movement with Fenianism. To give the movement force and vitality he appealed to self-interest. He avowed in the witness-box that the principle upon which he had always acted was to make the land question a stepping-stone to complete national independence, and he concluded, "I wish to God I could get it to-morrow." In the judgment of the Commissioners the object aimed at by Davitt and the other founders of the Land League with regard to the revolutionary party was not to put an end to or restrain its action by merging it in the new movement, but to point out to those holding Fenian opinions that the two parties did not clash, and that they might be of mutual aid to each other.

Consequently, the conclusion at which the Judges arrived on the first charge was that the respondents collectively had not been proved to have conspired to bring about total separation. But Davitt and his friends established and joined the Land League organisation with the purpose of bringing about the absolute independence of Ireland as a separate nation.

The second charge brought against the respondents was this: That one of the immediate objects of their conspiracy was, by a system of coercion and intimidation, to promote an agrarian agitation against the payment of agricultural rents, for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were styled the "English garrison." In their investigation of this charge, which mainly turned upon the subject of boycotting, the Judges refer to the rejection by the House of Lords, on August 3, 1880, of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill as likely to cause discontent among those who would have been benefited by the provisions of the Bill. They then deal with, and quote at length from, the speeches delivered at some of the numerous meetings held in the autumn of 1880 in furtherance of the Land League movement, which spread, in Mr. Parnell's words, "like wildfire." It was at this time that boycotting was first advocated. Mr. Dillon, for instance, said, on August 15, 1880, "Men of Kildare, it gives me greater pleasure than I can tell you of to see you assembled in such

numbers as will strike fear into the men who dream of turning a Kildare man out of his farm." A month later Lord Mountmorres was murdered near Clonbur, and no one could be apprehended. And on September 19, 1880, Mr. Parnell made his Ennis speech, which marks an epoch in the Land League agitation, since he there gave his sanction to the system of boycotting. His language was as follows: "Now, what are you to do to a tenant who bids for a farm from which his neighbour has been evicted? (Various shouts, among which "*Kill him!*" and "*Shoot him!*") Now I think I heard somebody say '*Shoot him!*'—("*Shoot him!*")—but I wish to point out to you a very much better way, a more Christian and more charitable way, which will give the lost sinner an opportunity of repenting. ("*Hear, hear.*") When a man takes a farm from which another has been evicted, you must show him on the roadside when you meet him, you must show him in the streets of the town, you must show him at the shop counter, you must show him in the fair and in the market-place, and even in the house of worship, by leaving him severely alone, by putting him into a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind as if he was a leper of old—you must show him your detestation of the crime he has committed, and you may depend upon it, if the population of a county in Ireland carry out this doctrine, that there will be no man so full of avarice, so lost of shame, as to dare the public opinion of all right-thinking men within the county, and to transgress your unwritten code of laws." (Cheers.)

This speech, says the Report, was taken as the model upon which the speeches of the organisers and leading members of the Land League were framed. The practice of boycotting was recommended in emphatic terms, and was adopted as a main instrument for the purpose of carrying out the unwritten law of the League. And a strenuous and combined effort was made, by means of speeches throughout the country, to arouse the passions of the people. From these speeches the Commissioners quote freely, giving in an Appendix the full text of some delivered by Mr. Dillon and Mr. Biggar. They then proceed to examine how the directions of the leaders and organisers were obeyed, and for this purpose they give four instances as typical of the manner in which boycotting was practised. They give examples only, beginning with that of Captain Boycott, from whom the system has derived its name, because of the great number of the instances in which persons obnoxious to the Land League were boycotted—that is, persecuted and ruined. Boycotting constituted a system of intimidation of a most severe and cruel character. It was directed not only against those who took land from which another had been evicted, but also against everyone who, directly or indirectly, offered any obstacle to the reign of the unwritten law of the League in the place of the law of the land. It was directed not only against those who paid their rent when others refused to pay; it was directed against agents of landlords, bailiffs, caretakers, emergency men called in to prevent the land becoming waste; against those who supplied goods to such men; and generally against all who supplied food or even spoke to boycotted persons; against those who refused to join the League; against those who gave evidence in courts of justice adverse to those accused of agrarian crime; against those who supplied cars to the police; against the children of boycotted persons and the schools they attended; and against a school because an assistant teacher was related to persons who had offended the League. The funerals of obnoxious persons were put under a similar ban, and even coffins or the wood to make them were withheld from the dead. Such was the system. Tenants had recourse

•

to all kinds of subterfuges in order to pay their rent without the fact becoming known to the League. The object of this elaborate and all-pervading tyranny was not only to injure the individual landlords against whom it was directed, by rendering their land useless to them unless they obeyed the edicts of the Land League, but also to injure the landlords as a class and drive them out of the country. The combination of which boycotting was the instrument was condemned by the Judges as illegal, both in its objects and the means which were adopted. The conclusion, therefore, at which they arrived on the second charge was that the leaders of the Land League who combined together to carry out the system of boycotting were guilty of a criminal conspiracy. One of the objects of this conspiracy was, as stated in the charge, by a system of coercion and intimidation to promote an agrarian agitation against the payment of agricultural rents for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were styled the "English garrison." This charge was found to be proved against forty-four of the respondents, at the head of the list standing the name C. S. Parnell, and at the end of it the name Michael Davitt.

We now turn to chronicle briefly the story of the suppression of the Land League, and the Phoenix Park murders. In 1880, informations were filed against Mr. Parnell and others, for conspiracy to induce tenants not to pay their rents. These are known as the "State trials." After a hearing in Dublin which lasted twenty-one days, the jury, being unable to agree, were discharged. Early in 1881 the Government passed the "Protection of Persons and Property (Ireland) Act," and acquired power to apprehend suspected persons. In February 1881, Egan, the active treasurer of the Land League, went to Paris with some of the League's books. In October Mr. Parnell was arrested and imprisoned in Kilmainham. Thereupon the "No Rent" manifesto was issued, but notwithstanding the efforts made to induce the tenant farmers generally to refuse to pay rent, the manifesto was not very successful. On October 18th the Land League was suppressed, and the books were removed to London by Mr. Campbell, M.P., the secretary of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. P. J. Sheridan. Meanwhile, the leaders of the League being in prison, the work was carried on by the Ladies' Land League, who received as much as 70,000*l.* from the Land League funds during the term of Mr. Parnell's imprisonment. Eventually, on May 2, 1882, Mr. Parnell and some other of the leaders who had been confined in Kilmainham were released, in pursuance of the arrangement which has been called the Kilmainham Treaty. Four days later, on May 8, 1882, the murders of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke took place in the Phoenix Park. The perpetrators of the murders were members of the Invincible Society, formed a few months before for the assassination of obnoxious officials. A charge was founded on the Attorney-General's speech in *O'Donnell v. Walter*, that the Invincibles were a branch of the Land League, and were organised and paid by Egan. The Judges, however, found that the Invincibles were not a branch of the Land League, and that the Land League did not organise or pay the Invincibles, nor did the respondents or any of them associate with any persons known by them to be employed in the Invincible conspiracy. As regards Mr. Parnell individually, the Commissioners consider that there is no foundation whatever for the charge that he was intimate with Invincibles, knowing them to be such, or that he had any knowledge, direct or indirect, of the conspiracy which resulted in the Phoenix Park murders. The Commissioners deal incidentally with another personal charge, which was made against Mr. Parnell specifically. This was the charge

"that at the time of the Kilmainham negotiations, Mr. Parnell knew that Sheridan and Boyton had been organising outrage, and therefore wished to use them to put down outrage." This was held not to have been proved. That Mr. Parnell should employ Sheridan and Boyton to quiet the disturbed districts was natural, as they had been organisers there, and had no doubt acquired influence in those districts. Mr. Parnell was undoubtedly aware of the inflammatory speeches they had made, but it was not proved that he knew that Sheridan and Boyton had organised crime.

This brings us to the third charge, with which the Commissioners dealt very briefly. The charge was that "when on certain occasions the respondents thought it politic to denounce, and did denounce, certain crimes in public, they afterwards led their supporters to believe that such denunciation was not sincere." This charge was chiefly based on the "facsimile" letter, which we have already quoted. The letter was one of a series obtained from Richard Pigott by Mr. Houston, the secretary of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic League, who afterwards supplied them to the manager of the *Times* upon payment of sums amounting to 2,580*l*. The story told by Pigott as to the manner in which he obtained these letters was entirely unworthy of credit, and before his examination was concluded he absconded and committed suicide. All the letters produced by him are found to be forgeries, and Mr. Parnell and the other respondents are entirely acquitted of the charge of insincerity in their denunciation of the Phoenix Park murders. Immediately after the Phoenix Park murders, Sir William Harcourt introduced a Bill for the Prevention of Crime in Ireland, which became law on July 12, 1882, and continued in force until the autumn of 1885.

The fourth charge brought against the respondents was that they disseminated the *Irish World* and other newspapers, tending to incite to sedition and the commission of other crime. The history of this newspaper movement may be shortly stated. During the years 1880, 1881, and 1882, the Land League disseminated throughout Ireland an American paper called the *Irish World*. It was edited by Patrick Ford, who, in conjunction with O'Donovan Rossa, originated the Skirmishing Fund. Until the summer or autumn of 1882, the *Irish World* was favourable to the League, and brought in three-fourths of the American money which was subscribed. It then ceased to co-operate with the League, but since the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill in 1886, Patrick Ford reverted to his former policy of supporting the League, and the terms in which the *Irish World* dealt were very strong. It spoke of laying London in ashes in twenty-four hours. "Then lay Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, likewise in ashes." Again, "for more reasons than one, we regret this last execution" [that of Lord Mountnorres]. And again, "every informer ought to die the death of a dog." In his evidence Davitt said that Ford was a man altogether misrepresented in England, and that he, Davitt, had yet to meet a better man, morally, both as a Christian and philanthropist, than Patrick Ford. As for indigenous newspapers, *United Ireland* was simply the organ of the Land League organisation. On the other hand, the *Irishman* newspaper had been the organ of the Physical Force or Fenian party, and the Commissioners infer from Mr. Parnell's purchase of that paper from Pigott in 1881, coupled with the manner in which it was conducted until its extinction in 1885, that Mr. Parnell's object was to address his Fenian supporters through that medium. The editor of both papers was Mr. William O'Brien, M.P. The Judges found that the numbers of *United Ireland* from

August 1881 to February 1882 almost invariably contained a column entitled "The Land War," or "The Campaign," or "The Spirit of the Country," or "Incidents of the Campaign." In these columns there were inserted short narratives of various outrages, which were thus treated as incidental to the land agitation. The disturbed country was called "the seat of war." O'Donnell, the murderer of Carey, is described as having slain a monster for whose destruction he would in most civilised nationalities have been deemed a public benefactor. On the other hand, there were articles of a more moderate character—for instance, the denunciation of the Phoenix Park murders, an article which was headed "In Token of Abhorrence and Shame for the Stain cast upon the Character of our Nation for Manliness and Hospitality." The Commissioners gave many samples from *United Ireland*. We can give but few. As to the *Irishman*, its utterances were as violent as can well be conceived. On December 23, 1882, while the preliminary investigation which led to the detection of the Phoenix Park murderers was being prosecuted, the following article appeared:—"The Spanish Inquisition was blunt and brutal; the Star Chamber was a diabolical institution; but the inquisition going on for the last fortnight in Dublin Castle is more horrible and disgraceful than either." When O'Donnell murdered James Carey, the *Irishman* said that "In all parts of the world the Irish would contribute their last shilling to save the life of the man who did the most popular murder since Talbot was shot in Dublin." Talbot was a police-constable, who had also been assassinated. Such articles were deservedly characterised by Archbishop Walsh as "simply abominable," and with this estimate of them the judges agreed. Mr. Parnell did not denounce the use of dynamite or the Physical Force party either in Ireland or America; and he did not, by speech or action, find fault with the Fenian organisation. As regards this fourth charge, the finding is that the respondents did disseminate newspapers which tended to incite to sedition and the commission of other crime.

The fifth charge was that the respondents by their speeches, and for payments for that purpose, incited persons to the commission of crime, including murders. On this head the Commissioners say at once that the charge that the respondents by their speeches, or otherwise, incited persons to the commission of murder, or that the Land League chiefs based their schemes on a system of assassination, has not been substantiated. "No proof has been given, and we do not believe that there was any intention on the part of the respondents, or any of them, to procure any murder, or murder in general, to be committed; and further, we believe that even those of them who have used the most dangerous language did not intend to cause the perpetration of murder. But while we acquit the respondents of having directly or intentionally incited to murder, we find that the speeches made, in which land-grabbers and other offenders against the League were denounced as traitors, and as being as bad as informers—the urging young men to procure arms, and the dissemination of newspapers above referred to—had the effect of causing an excitable peasantry to carry out the laws of the Land League even by assassination. This appears to us to be confirmed by the proof, so frequently given in the course of this inquiry, that murders and attempts to kill or maim, and other outrages, were committed because the victims had done something in contravention of the rules of the Land League such as taking evicted or surrendered land and paying rent." In proof of this they cite some fourteen instances of agrarian outrage, in several cases of murder, which followed upon infraction of the rules of the Land League.

They then take the statistics of crime during the years 1880, 1881, and 1882, as strongly corroborating the evidence of those witnesses who stated that outrages followed as a consequence in those districts in which the Land League was established. There is no room for doubt that agrarian crime was raging in Ireland during the three years already mentioned, when the Land League agitation was at its height. The following Table shows the total amount of agrarian crime during the ten years 1877 to 1886 in all Ireland:—

| 1877 | 1878 | 1879 | 1880 | 1881 | 1882 | 1883 | 1884 | 1885 | 1886 |
|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| 236 | 301 | 863 | 2,589 | 4,439 | 3,432 | 870 | 762 | 944 | 1,056 |

It is impossible, say the judges, to study the figures, of which the most striking have been printed above, without seeing that the rise of agrarian crime was coincident with the activity of the Land League, and the coincidence of the decrease of agrarian crime with the inactivity of the Land League is found to be equally conspicuous. The National League, though founded in October 1882, did not show much activity till the year 1885. In 1885 came the General Election, and consequently the branches of the League trebled in that year. From the table above it is to be seen how large was the increase in agrarian crime coincidently with the renewed activity of the National League. It is under this head that the Judges deal with the arguments most strongly urged by Sir Charles Russell on behalf of the respondents. It was contended that the causes of crime were not to be found in the agitation of the League, but in the chronic state of crime into which Ireland was wont to lapse when distress, exaggerated by eviction and the fear of it, set in. It was asserted that as, following on the famine years of 1846-48, ejectments and threats of ejectments multiplied, crime increased, so in the years 1879-82 like causes produced like results. It was further suggested that the crime was the work of secret societies, acting in antagonism to the League; and, lastly, that it resulted from the House of Lords having thrown out the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in August 1880. These hypotheses the Commissioners reject. Consider the character of the crime. A large portion of the outrages were committed upon persons who had taken land from which others had been evicted, another large portion upon those who had paid their rent, and another upon those who had disobeyed the laws of the League. The three classes of crime were generally perpetrated by means of outrage committed at night, ordinarily known as "moonlighting." And in many instances the pressure which began in boycotting culminated in outrage upon the person boycotted. As to the argument founded upon distress and eviction, it is unquestionable that there was great privation among the tenants on the western seaboard of Ireland in the winter and spring of 1879 and 1880. Relief funds were raised to the extent of 360,000*l*. The year 1879 was the worst year since the years of the great famine, 1846-48. But 1880 was a bountiful year, and 1881 and 1882 were average years. It was contended that the increased evictions which took place in the years 1878-82 had created fear in the minds of the tenants that the evictions of 1848 and the subsequent years were about to recur, and that the crime of 1880-82 arose from this fact, and not from the agitation of the Land League. The Judges do not doubt that evictions and fear of evictions were contributory causes of agrarian crime, but in their judgment the increase in evictions, which began

in 1879 and continued during subsequent years, was the result of the agitation against the landlords. As for the analogy between the years 1879-82 and the years 1849-52, which succeeded the famine, the aggregate figures of those years speak for themselves. In the four years 1849-52, there were 58,428 families evicted, and 4,245 agrarian crimes. In the four years 1879-82, there were 11,964 families evicted, and 11,838 agrarian crimes. Then as to the suggestion that crime was caused by secret societies acting in antagonism to the Land League, the Commissioners believe in the accuracy of Mr. Parnell's statement in the House of Commons on January 7, 1881, to which we have already referred, that secret societies, other than that of the Fenian conspiracy, had then ceased to exist in Ireland. And as to the third suggestion, viz., that the throwing out of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in August 1880 was the origin of the increase of crime, the Judges express their opinion that it was not the effective cause of that increase, but that it arose from the agitation of which the rejection of the Disturbance Bill was made the occasion. Nor do they follow Sir Charles Russell in attributing the decrease of crime which took place after July 1882 to the conciliatory effect of the Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, which had become law in April 1882.

Finally upon the question whether the action of the leaders of the Land League agitation contributed to produce the increase of agrarian crime from 1879 to 1882, the Commissioners find that that increase, though not exclusively to be ascribed to the agitation, was mainly due to the action of the Land League, its founders and leaders. Generally upon the fifth charge they find that the respondents did not directly incite persons to the commission of crime other than intimidation, but that they did incite to intimidation, and that the consequence of that incitement was that crime and outrage were committed by the persons incited. They find that it was not proved that the respondents made payments for the purpose of inciting persons to commit crime.

The next charge, the sixth, lies in a small compass. It was that the respondents did nothing to prevent crime, and expressed no *bona fide* disapproval of it. The history of this matter is brief. When Davitt returned from America in November 1880, he was alarmed at the great increase of crime that had occurred. He at once told Mr. Parnell that this crime, apart from its moral wrong, would damage their cause both at home and abroad, and that some steps must be taken to check it. Mr. Parnell had on several occasions condemned crime, but he had done so in a manner which, at least in some instances, he admitted was insufficient. He said that he was not aware at the time of the increase of crime; and that when he became aware of it, he always condemned it. In December 1880, a memorandum of instructions was, with Mr. Parnell's approval, drawn up by Mr. Davitt and addressed to organisers and officers of the branches of the Land League. The memorandum only condemned threatening letters and injuries inflicted upon dumb animals as unjustifiable. It failed to condemn the other kinds of outrage and intimidation which had been put in force against the so-called "enemies of the people and traitors to the League." Davitt in his speeches denounced crime, but made no reference to the special evils resulting from intimidation and boycotting which had been continued with undiminished severity. Meanwhile some of his coadjutors, including Mr. Dillon and Mr. Biggar, delivered speeches which were calculated to excite rather than allay the tendency to illegality. Doubtless many of those who joined the League were sincerely opposed to crime, and were honestly

desirous that it should be avoided. But their denunciations of crime were of little avail, because contemporaneously with them the leaders and organisers were carrying on the agitation by means of speeches and conduct tending to encourage crime. Mr. M. Harris, M.P., said in the witness-box that the denunciation of crime upon the platform would not have much effect, because the people would think that it was "talking to the police, and that it was all gammon." Certainly no steps whatever were taken by the Land League, as an organisation, to aid in the detection of crime. This fact is to some extent discounted by the feeling so largely entertained in Ireland that the detection of criminals is solely the affair of the police, and that it is not the duty of anyone else to aid in the discovery. The great obstacle to the detection and punishment of crime in Ireland is the unwillingness of the mass of the people to give information to aid in the discovery and prosecution of the criminals. To give information to the police is looked upon as a base act, and the person who does it is held up to opprobrium under the name of "informer." This feeling is not confined to the ignorant, but is shared by those from whose education and position it was to be expected that juster views would prevail of the duty of persons able to assist in the detection of crime. Thus it is that evidence can rarely be obtained. The evidence of informers has therefore to be used, and then the police, and even the Government, are denounced for taking the lives of innocent men. "Thus a vicious circle is established. To make the police acquainted with the name of a criminal is to become an informer; to become an informer is base, and the evidence of such a person is untrustworthy and ought not to be used. And thus impunity is secured for the guilty." Upon this sixth allegation the finding of the Judges was that while some of the respondents, and in particular Mr. Davitt, did express *bona fide* disapproval of crime and outrage, the respondents did not denounce the system of intimidation which led to crime and outrage, but persisted in it with knowledge of its effect.

The seventh charge lies in even smaller compass than the sixth. It is that the respondents subscribed to testimonials for, and were intimately associated with, notorious criminals, defended persons supposed to be guilty of agrarian crime, supported their families, and made payments to procure the escape of criminals from justice. Of the five allegations contained in this charge two have, in the judgment of the Commission, been proved, while three have not been proved. Proof was given that the Land League systematically and indiscriminately paid for the defence of persons charged with agrarian crimes. To supply the means of defence to prisoners is not in itself unjustifiable, but the Judges entertain no doubt that the knowledge that such assistance would in all cases be afforded must have the effect of encouraging persons disposed to commit outrage, and the same observations apply to the support of their families. That the practice of the Land League with regard to the defence of prisoners was felt to be dangerous was shown by the evidence of Mr. Parnell, who stated that he disapproved of it and endeavoured to stop it, but his remonstrance was apparently ineffectual. The only excuse offered was that it was necessary to defend accused persons against the attempts of the Government and its officers to procure the conviction of innocent persons. In this connexion Mr. Parnell said of the convict Nally, "I believe of Patrick Nally that he is a victim of the conspiracy which was formed between Lord Spencer—(*groans*)—and the informers of their country for the purpose to obtain victims to what they called 'law and justice' by any and every means, whether they were innocent or not." The Commissioners cannot suppose

that Mr. Parnell really believed in the justice of the accusation then made by him against Lord Spencer. On the other hand, although it was proved that Mr. Parnell paid a sum of 100*l.* to F. Byrne at his request immediately before he left the country, yet it was satisfactorily shown that the payment had no connexion with the flight of Byrne, and that Mr. Parnell had no knowledge of his intention to leave, or of the cause. Mr. Parnell was alleged to have made an "opportune remittance which enabled F. Byrne to escape to France before the warrant for his arrest reached Scotland Yard." This allegation was not established. The finding of the Commissioners upon this seventh charge is that the respondents did defend persons charged with agrarian crime and supported their families, but that it had not been proved that they subscribed to testimonials for, or were intimately associated with, notorious criminals, or that they made payments to procure the escape of criminals from justice.

The dimensions of the eighth head of inquiry are small, for a reason which will immediately appear. The charge was that the respondents made compensation to persons who had been injured in the commission of crime. This is obviously a matter of accounts and documents; and of all the correspondence which was once undoubtedly in the possession of the Land League officials, the Commissioners only had before them a few letters which came from an *employé* of the League, Alexander Phillips. Among these letters there were two of importance. The first was one from Timothy Horan, containing, in the judgment of the Commissioners, an application for compensation to persons injured whilst in the commission of some criminal act. An endorsement on this letter showed that 6*l.* had been paid to the applicant by the chairman of the executive committee of the Land League. The second letter was one from the Land League office, written by William Doriss. Upon this letter was a memorandum in the handwriting of John Butterfield, a very active organiser, recommending for a grant of 2*l.* each three men then in gaol awaiting their trial at the Mullingar Assizes on a charge of "intimidation and housebreaking." The charge, said the Commissioners, doubtless referred to some act of moonlighting, and the 6*l.* asked for by Butterfield was paid to him out of the Land League funds. It would seem that this payment would have been more aptly noticed under the seventh charge, that of defending persons supposed to be guilty of agrarian crime. Be that as it may, the Commissioners base upon the two items, the Horan payment and the Doriss payment, their finding that the respondents did make payments to compensate persons who had been injured in the commission of crime.

It is under this same head that the Report deals with the Land League accounts, the formation of the National League in 1882, and the revival of the agitation in 1885. The bankers of the League were the Hibernian Bank in Dublin, but their books, kept in conformity with the practice of banking in Ireland, did not show in whose favour the cheques on the various accounts were drawn. Very few counterfoils of returned paid cheques were produced to show the details of these payments. But a published letter of October 14, 1882, from Mr. Egan to Mr. Parnell, contains the treasurer's account of receipts and expenditure up to that time. The receipts were stated at 244,820*l.*, and amongst the items of expenditure was one of 148,000*l.*, under the head "General Land League and Ladies' Land League, in support of evicted tenants, providing wooden houses, law costs, sheriffs' sales, defence against ejectments, various local law proceedings, and general expenses of organisations." Of this 148,000*l.*, about

40,000*l.* was accounted for in the evidence before the Commission; of the remaining 108,000*l.*, over 70,000*l.* went to the Ladies' Land League. No account was given in evidence of the expenditure either of the money handed over to the Ladies' Land League or of the residue of the 108,000*l.* Thus the Judges had over 100,000*l.* of Land League funds received, but no details of the manner in which it was expended. No audit of the funds was ever made by a professional accountant, and according to Mr. Parnell there was never any audit of the Land League expenditure at all, only an informal audit of the sums received by Egan and paid over by Egan in Paris to the Land League. Turning to the books and documents of the Land League, they were unquestionably numerous and bulky, but only four small books of account were produced. Davitt spoke of "thousands of letters," and Phillips of "a sackful of letters" arriving every morning. None of these appeared, and no valid excuse was given for their non-production. The books of the National Bank containing the entries for the years down to 1883 had been destroyed by the Bank in March, 1889, according to their usual course of business. The Commissioners also observe upon the non-production of the cash-books and ledgers for the years 1881-83 of the Land League of Great Britain, of which Frank Byrne was the then secretary. Mr. Justin MacCarthy had stated in an affidavit of October 9, 1888, that he had obtained a list of the books, which he was willing should be produced. During the course of the case the production of those cash-books and ledgers for the years named proved to be of importance. When called for, Mr. MacCarthy was unable either to produce them or to explain their non-production. The solicitor for the respondents stated that a mistake had been made in the affidavit. How the suggested mistake arose, if any did arise, was never explained, nor were the books for the years in question produced. Further, it appeared that in 1881 Egan kept an account in Paris at the bank of Messrs. Monro & Co. A commission was appointed to examine these books, but Messrs. Monro declined to allow them to be seen. Mr. Parnell was requested to give authority to Messrs. Monro to produce the accounts relative to the Land League. Thus he refused to do. The Commissioners were therefore deprived of evidence upon the question how the funds of the Land League were expended in the years 1881 and 1882. On that subject the Judges say generally that they did not receive from Mr. Parnell and the officers of the Land League the assistance they were entitled to expect in the investigation of the Land League accounts, in order that it might be seen how its funds were expended.

Coming now to the formation, on October 17, 1882, of the National League, or, more formally, the National Land League of Ireland, the judges consider that the National League, like the Ladies' Land League, was substantially the suppressed Land League under another name. Formed on the suggestion of Mr. Davitt, adopted by Mr. Parnell, it gradually gained in numbers. Mr. T. Harrington attempting during the first two or three years of its history to extend it to the portions of Ireland that were quiet, and stating that he wanted to keep the organisation free from any districts where crime had prevailed. During the years 1883 and 1884 the agitation by speeches was diminished, but early in 1885 it was revived by Mr. John O'Connor, M.P., and Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P. The latter said in one speech: "There is not a capital in Europe which knows the fall of Khartoum the other day but received it with joy and exultation, and with a great wish and prayer of 'more power to the Mahdi and his men.'" Mr. William Redmond, M.P., spoke of the men who were being boycotted as "the enemies of both God and man"; and Mr.

Biggar, M.P., enounced an opinion that land-grabbers were *greater criminals* than most men who died upon the scaffold. In fact, during this year (1885) boycotting was again strenuously recommended by the leaders of the agitation; the land-grabber was denounced; courts were held by the branch leagues, to which persons who disobeyed the edicts of the League were summoned. The names of those who did not join the League were published, and the resolutions come to at League meetings were set forth openly in the newspapers supporting Mr. Parnell. Thus in 1885 there was a distinct revival of the Land League agitation. That it was accompanied by an increase in crime has been already shown. With the end of 1885 the narrative of events in Ireland, as recounted by the Commissioners, terminates.

We turn from Ireland to the United States to trace the course of the Land League movement across the Atlantic, and its connexion with the Clan-na-Gael. This comes under the ninth charge, which is summed up in a sentence—viz., that the respondents invited the assistance and co-operation of, and accepted subscriptions from, known advocates of crime and dynamite. Mention has already been made of the United Brotherhood, or Clan-na-Gael, as the Fenian organisation of Irish residents in America, which desired to see Ireland an independent republic. Early in 1881 the Clan-na-Gael was acting apart from the Irish National Land League of America. This latter body met at Buffalo in January, and at this convention the receipt of some 4,000 dollars was announced, besides a good deal of money which had been sent direct to Egan in Europe. Differences arose between the Clan-na-Gael and the Land League of America, and it was to these influences that the remarks related which were attributed by Major Le Caron to Mr. Parnell. To these we have already referred, dealing at the same time with Mr. Parnell's recollection of the circumstances, and with the judgment on the matter which is given in the Report of the Commission.

On August 3, 1881, the tenth annual convention of the Clan-na-Gael met under the presidency of Alexander Sullivan. The proceedings of this convention show that a dynamite policy had then been adopted by the Clan-na-Gael. One of its committees reported that a special department had been established "for instruction in engineering, chemicals, draughting and mining, and other branches of the higher and technical departments of warfare." Mr. Parnell was unable to visit America this autumn, but sent a strong expression of his sympathy and gratitude for the movement; and two members of Parliament, Mr. T. P. O'Connor and Mr. T. M. Healy, went over to represent their leader at the Chicago convention of the Land League. To this the members of the Clan-na-Gael were urgently invited, and the convention opened on November 30, 1881, with Mr. Hynes, a member of the Clan-na-Gael, in the chair, empowered to nominate committees. Violent speeches were made, among them being one by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, in which he said that "if he were an agent of an insurance society, he would not like to have his whole organisation and corporation dependent on the ten thousand farmers who will go into the farms that the other ten thousand have been evicted from." The resolutions declared English rule in Ireland to be without either legal or moral sanction, and endorsed the policy of the Irish leaders at home and the No Rent manifesto. The Rev. George Betts, a member of the Clan-na-Gael, was elected president, with power to appoint all committees. An executive committee was then empowered "to call any future conventions, and also to confer and act with the leaders of the different organisations here represented, or any others that may be hereafter organised to further the

interest of Irish rights in promoting the objects and redeeming the pledges contained in the address and resolutions adopted by this convention." Mr. Betts then appointed an executive committee of seven, among whom were Patrick Ford (of the *Irish World*), Alexander Sullivan, the president, and two other members of the Clan-na-Gael. The proceedings at this convention show that the Clan-na-Gael obtained power through the chairman, a member of their body, to appoint on the executive committee a majority of persons supporting the Clan-na-Gael policy.

The next Land League convention was held at Washington on April 12, 1882, and was remarkable for a letter from Egan, saying that the Land League regarded the land question only in the light of a step towards national independence, which was and should continue to be the goal of all their efforts. Immediately after the Phoenix Park murders, in May 1882, Mr. Davitt went to Paris to see Egan, and then sailed to America for the third time. Ample contributions being promised at a meeting held at Astor House on July 18, he returned to Ireland to devise the National League and to persuade Mr. Parnell to join it on a platform of peasant proprietary. Early in 1883 Patrick Egan arrived in America and went at once to the house of Alexander Sullivan. In April three distinct conventions were summoned to Philadelphia for the same date—viz., the Clan-na-Gael, which met in secret, the Irish Land League convention, and the Irish American National convention. Secret meetings of the Clan-na-Gael were held on each day preceding the open meetings of the convention, and at these meetings Patrick Egan and Brennan were present. The old Land League was merged in the new National League. The Irish National League took the place of the Irish National Land League of America, and by means of a committee of seven (of whom four were Clan-na-Gael men) the Clan-na-Gael obtained the control over the entire Land League movement in America, and thenceforward retained it.

In the same month, April 1883, explosions took place in London, and at one of these, that at London Bridge, Lomasney is supposed to have perished. His family was afterwards supported by the Clan-na-Gael. In June, Gallagher and others were convicted at the Old Bailey, before the Lord Chief Justice of England, of feloniously compassing to depose the Queen, of intending to levy war upon the Queen, and to intimidate the Houses of Parliament by the use of dynamite. Shortly afterwards a circular was issued by Alex. Sullivan and the executive of the Clan-na-Gael to its members, advocating dynamite, and advising the punishment of traitors. In this circular was the following allusion to the trial of Gallagher: "By a solemn decision of the highest authority of Fohmboe (England), presided over by her Chief Justice, we have compelled her to recognise a new epoch in the art of war. Had these men invaded Fohmboe (England) with a musket, they would have suffered no less." Another convention was held at Boston, in August 1884, to which Mr. Sexton, M.P., and Mr. W. Rednond, M.P., were the delegates from Ireland. The accounts here read showed a sum of 4,767 dollars for the Parliamentary Fund, and 17,517 dollars for the Parnell testimonial. On the executive committee who were then appointed were no less than seven members of the Clan-na-Gael. After this for two years no further open convention was held. Alexander Sullivan remained at the head of the Clan-na-Gael, and Patrick Egan, a member of the Clan-na-Gael, was president of the Irish National League. Unceasing efforts were made to strengthen the hands of the Irish party at home by means of a Parliamentary fund. At the convention held at Chicago in August 1886, the balance-sheet

for the two years showed a sum of 314,452 dollars, "transmitted to C. S. Parnell and trustees of the Parliamentary Fund." Of this sum the Irish members of Parliament received in the year 1886 7,556*l.*, and in 1887 10,500*l.* At this convention Patrick Egan, being still a member of the Clan-na-Gael, as well as president of the National League of America, was entrusted with the proxies obtained through the instrumentality of the Clan-na-Gael.

Reviewing the evidence which bore upon this ninth charge, the Commissioners consider it proved that the Irish National League of America was, since the Philadelphia convention in April 1883, directed by the Clan-na-Gael, a body actively engaged in promoting the use of dynamite for the destruction of life and property in England; and that the two organisations concurrently collected sums amounting to more than 60,000*l.* for a fund called the Parliamentary Fund, out of which payments were made to Irish members, as has been stated. The names of these recipients were not disclosed in the inquiry. It was not proved that Mr. Parnell or any of the respondents knew that the Clan-na-Gael had obtained this overwhelming influence, or was collecting money for the Parliamentary Fund, and the operations of the Clan-na-Gael were secret. On the other hand, the Judges held it proved that Mr. Parnell and the other respondents invited and obtained the assistance and co-operation of the Physical Force party in America, including the Clan-na-Gael, and, in order to obtain that assistance, abstained from repudiating or condemning the action of that party. Also that they invited the assistance and co-operation of Patrick Ford, a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite.

Following the lines laid down by the Commissioners, we have now gone through the nine charges against the respondents, and we have mentioned incidentally the three specific charges against Mr. Parnell, which were held respectively to be not proved, to be unfounded, and to be not substantiated. It remains only to deal with the two special charges relating to Mr. Davitt, to whose speech in his own defence, it may be mentioned in passing, Sir James Hannen paid a high compliment. Mr. Davitt was unquestionably, as he was charged with being, a member of the Fenian organisation, and convicted as such, and he received money from a fund which had been contributed for the purpose of outrage and crime—viz., the Skirmishing Fund. It was not, however, for the formation of the Land League itself, but for the promotion of the agitation which led up to it. This money, a sum of 408*l.*, Mr. Davitt afterwards returned out of his own resources. The second special allegation against him was that he was in close and intimate association with the party of violence in America, and mainly instrumental in bringing about the alliance between that party and the Parnellite and Home Rule party in America. The judges have found that he was in such close and intimate association for the purpose of bringing about, and that he was mainly instrumental in bringing about, that alliance.

For the convenience of our readers it may be well to recapitulate in this place the nine conclusions to which the judges came. They run as follows:—

I. "We find that the respondent Members of Parliament collectively were not members of a conspiracy having for its object to establish the absolute independence of Ireland, but we find that some of them, together with Mr. Davitt, established and joined in the Land League organisation with the intention, by its means, to bring about the absolute independence of Ireland as a separate nation." The names of those respondents are set out in the Report.

II. "We find that the respondents did enter into a conspiracy, by a system of coercion and intimidation, to promote an agrarian agitation against

the payment of agricultural rents, for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords, who were styled 'the English garrison.'

III. "We find that the charge that 'when on certain occasions they thought it politic to denounce, and did denounce, certain crimes in public, they afterwards led their supporters to believe such denunciations were not sincere 'is not established.' We entirely acquit Mr. Parnell and the other respondents of the charge of insincerity in their denunciation of the Phoenix Park murders, and find that the 'fac-simile' letter on which this charge was chiefly based, as against Mr. Parnell, is a forgery.

IV. "We find that the respondents did disseminate the *Irish World* and other newspapers tending to incite to sedition and the commission of other crime.

V. "We find that the respondents did not directly incite persons to the commission of crime other than intimidation, but that they did incite to intimidation, and that the consequence of that incitement was that crime and outrage were committed by the persons incited. We find that it has not been proved that the respondents made payments for the purpose of inciting persons to commit crime.

VI. "We find as to the allegation that the respondents did nothing to prevent crime, and expressed no *bona fide* disapproval; that some of the respondents, and in particular Mr. Davitt, did express *bona fide* disapproval of crime and outrage, but that the respondents did not denounce the system of intimidation which led to crime and outrage, but persisted in it with knowledge of its effect.

VII. "We find that the respondents did defend persons charged with agrarian crime, and supported their families, but that it has not been proved that they subscribed to testimonials for, or were intimately associated with, notorious criminals, or that they made payments to procure the escape of criminals from justice.

VIII. "We find, as to the allegation that the respondents made payments to compensate persons who had been injured in the commission of crime, that they did make such payments.

IX. "As to the allegation that the respondents invited the assistance and co-operation of and accepted subscriptions of money from known advocates of crime and the use of dynamite, we find that the respondents did invite the assistance and co-operation of and accepted subscriptions of money from Patrick Ford, a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite, but that it has not been proved that the respondents, or any of them, knew that the Clan-na-Gael controlled the League, or was collecting money for the Parliamentary Fund. It has been proved that the respondents invited and obtained the assistance and co-operation of the Physical Force party in America, including the Clan-na-Gael, and in order to obtain that assistance abstained from repudiating or condemning the action of that party."

We cannot more fitly conclude this review of the principal landmarks in the story which began with the publication of "Parnellism and Crime," and ended with the report of the Special Commission, than by quoting the words with which Sir James Hannen brought the public sittings of the Commission to an end. They were words most impressively delivered, which will not be forgotten by those who heard them. "We must bear our burden a little longer. But one hope supports us. Conscious that throughout this great inquest we have sought only the truth, we trust that we shall be guided to find it, and set it forth plainly in the sight of all men."

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

IN 1889.

JANUARY.

1. A total eclipse of the sun, visible throughout North America, seen to great advantage at the numerous stations and observatories established by the astronomers and scientific societies.

— The sovereigns and prime ministers of the principal European states at their New Year's receptions expressed their belief in the maintenance of peace in Europe during the year.

2. The new Servian Constitution proposed by the King accepted by a large majority of the Skuptehina, of which nearly all the members were returned as Oppositionists.

— The New York Electric Sugar Refining Company, of which the shares had been sold at two or three hundred per cent. premium, suddenly collapsed. The manager's widow disappeared, and the machinery, which had been kept in a locked room, was discovered to be of the simplest description, and incapable of producing any of the results claimed. In Liverpool and Birmingham the shares were largely held.

3. A serious colliery explosion took place in the centre of the coal district of Asturia, in which thirty persons lost their lives.

— A number of evictions were made in West Donegal, which were met by resistance and serious disturbances. The magistrate in attendance having at length given orders to the military to load their rifles, the ringleaders surrendered, and the crowd separated.

4. The correspondence published between Sir Robert Morier, H.M. Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and Count Herbert Bismarck respecting the alleged information given to Marshal Bazaine in 1870. The German Foreign Secretary declined to interfere with the newspaper which had propagated the libels.

— An important deputation of merchants and shipowners waited on Lord Salisbury to urge upon him the necessity of making provision for the better defence of our ports and maritime towns.

5. Dr. Geffcken, after an arbitrary imprisonment of ninety-nine days on

a charge of high treason, released unconditionally by order of the Supreme Court of Leipzig.

5. After the final contest at base-ball at Melbourne between Australian and American teams, Spalding, the Australian champion thrower, challenged the Americans to throw the cricket ball against him. An American named Crane won easily by a throw of 128 yards 10½ inches—the longest on record.

6. At an early hour of the morning a fire broke out in the Metropolitan Meat Market, and about forty butchers' shops in the Central Avenue destroyed.

— In the Charente and the Somme the Boulangist candidates returned by large majorities over their Republican opponents.

7. "Clouds," East Knoyle, near Salisbury, the residence of Hon. Percy Wyndham, which had been built some few years, and furnished with every modern improvement, almost completely destroyed by fire, involving a loss of wood-carving, furniture, and buildings estimated at 100,000*l*.

— The United States Senate passed a resolution by 49 to 8, in secret session, declaring that it would look with serious disapproval on any European Government taking any action with regard to the control of the Panama Canal.

8. The "unemployed," numbering about 500, attempted to hold a meeting in front of the Royal Exchange, but a very small force of the city police succeeded in keeping the crowd moving and the space clear.

— A daring burglary attempted at Muswell Hill by three men, who, on being disturbed and pursued, attacked the owners with revolvers, wounding one of them, Mr. George Atkin, in two places very severely. The burglars succeeded in making their escape; but four men were subsequently arrested in various places, and committed for trial; one of them turning Queen's evidence.

9. Mr. and Mrs. Chamberlain publicly welcomed home by a large gathering of fellow-townpeople at the Birmingham Town Hall, on which occasion a magnificent wedding gift to the couple was presented.

— A cyclone passing over the Pittsburg district of Pennsylvania threw down a partially finished building, on which 100 workmen were employed. Seventeen men were instantly killed, and upwards of fifty others seriously injured. At Reading, about six hours later, the tornado did even more damage—throwing down a silk factory, five storeys high, in which were 350 work-people—many of whom were killed. At Brooklyn, near New York, frightful damage to life and property was done; and as far off as Niagara the wind caught and destroyed the greater part of the chain bridge across the falls.

10. The Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 5 to 4 per cent.; the coin and bullion being 20,470,865*l*., and the reserve amounting to 12,491,290*l*., or 38½ per cent. of the liabilities.

— News arrived from Central Africa of the outbreak of a revolution at Uganda, and the consequent dispersal of the missionaries, and murder of their converts, the missionaries themselves, English and French, escaping with their lives.

11. The formation announced of a Central Railway Board, composed of the presidents of the principal railroads in the United States, having for object the general supervision of rates, &c.

11. A wooden coffin discovered in the crypt of the parish church of Trujillo bearing the inscription, "Herein lies the pretended corpse of Francisco Pizarro." The body had been carefully embalmed and wrapped in a violet cloth, but no jewels or ornaments were found in the coffin. The face was said to bear a close resemblance to the portraits of Pizarro.

13. The German Mission House at Tagu, on the Zanzibar coast, where the majority of the slaves rescued by the German cruiser *Leydig* were lodged, attacked by the Arabs and completely destroyed. Four out of nine German missionaries were massacred, including one lady, and the slaves and mission servants carried away.

— A serious fire destroyed a large part of the Chester General Post Office, devoted to the receipt and despatch of the mails and the telegraph work. Only one instrument was saved, but by this communication was maintained, and fresh instruments arrived and the circuits were promptly re-established.

14. The Prussian Landtag opened by the Emperor William with a lengthy speech, almost wholly devoted to domestic and economic questions.

— At Marseilles, a house in the Quartier Belzunce, a house chiefly inhabited by Italians, suddenly collapsed, and seven of its occupants were killed and nine severely injured.

15. On the reassembling of the Parnell Commission Mr. William O'Brien and the Hon. Geo. Brodrick appeared to answer to charges of contempt of Court preferred against them. After summarily dismissing the charge against Mr. Brodrick (Warden of Merton College), Mr. Justice Hannen eventually decided to take the same course with regard to Mr. O'Brien.

— Two aeronauts, who ascended from Antwerp at 11 A.M., found themselves towards the afternoon carried out to sea, and were ultimately picked up by a steamer during the night. One of the aeronauts had, however, been drowned.

16. The Berlin official *Anzeiger* published by command of the Emperor Prince Bismarck's representation of the case of the Government against Dr. Geffcken, in which the Supreme Court had decided in favour of the latter.

— A convention signed between the municipality of Rome and the German Ambassador, acting in the name of the other Protestant Powers, by which the old Protestant cemetery at Rome was to be ceded to the municipality in exchange for another piece of land, and on the understanding that the strip containing the remains of Keats and Severn should be left untouched.

17. The polling for the County Council elections held throughout the metropolitan districts. Little excitement was shown in any part of London, and in few cases did more than one-half of the electors go to the poll. Party politics were in most cases excluded, but the old members of the Metropolitan Board of Works were generally thrown out. Two ladies, Lady Sandhurst (Brixton) and Miss Jane Cobden (Bromley and Bow), were among the councillors elected.

— Dr. Von Friedberg, the first person on whom the Emperor Frederick conferred the order of the Black Eagle of Prussia, resigned his post as Minister of Justice.

— A serious earthquake felt in the neighbourhood of Sparta, Asia Minor, in which 300 houses were destroyed.

18. The seat for the Govan district of Lanarkshire, rendered vacant by the death of Sir William Pearce (C.), carried by Mr. John Wilson (G.L.) with 4,420 votes against 3,349 given to Sir John Pender (L.U.)

— A terrible colliery explosion took place at the Hyde Colliery, belonging to Messrs. Sidebotham, by which thirty lives were lost.

— A serious fire broke out in the Imperial Palace at Peking, by which the Treasury, the Seventeenth Audience Hall, and numerous other buildings were destroyed.

19. A collision took place in the English Channel off Walmer between the *Denbighshire*, 1,367 tons registered, a full-rigged warship, and the four-masted screw steamer *Duke of Buckingham*, 3,123 tons. The former was struck amidships and sank in a few minutes, and two men lost their lives. The *Duke of Buckingham*, although seriously damaged, was held afloat by her watertight bulkhead.

— The French Ministry prohibited the performance of "L'Officier Bleu," a comedy by "Ary Eclair," on the ground of the offence it might give to the Russian Government.

21. The grand opera house at St. Paul, Minnesota, valued at \$200,000, totally destroyed by fire. There was no one in the building when the fire occurred.

— A fire broke out at an early hour at the Ormonde Club, near the Elephant and Castle, New Kent Road, and speedily extended to the neighbouring premises. A considerable portion of the railway station was destroyed, and the theatre recently erected narrowly escaped.

— The Home Secretary addressed a circular letter to magistrates throughout the country, impressing upon them the undesirability of sending to prison children who have been committed for trial at the quarter sessions or assizes.

22. Mr. John Morley addressed a meeting of 10,000 persons at Sheffield, and defended himself against the charge of being indifferent to Imperial duties.

— The Marchioness of Salisbury and Countess of Rosebery informally presented a diamond bracelet to Mrs. Phelps, the wife of the American Minister, on her leaving England, as "a token of affectionate regard from some of her English friends."

23. The Prince and Princess of Wales went from Aske Hall to Middlesbrough to open the new Town Hall and Municipal buildings.

— The County Councils met in various parts of the country for the first time, and elected their Chairmen and Aldermen.

— Mr. W. L. Wyllie, a painter of marine subjects, elected an Associate of the Royal Academy.

— A number of murders almost identical in their features with those in Whitechapel—of which the last was on November 9—committed at Managua in Nicaragua; and similar murders and mutilations stated to have been committed about three weeks previously in Jamaica.

24. A grand banquet given at the Mansion House by the Lord Mayor to the United States Minister, Mr. Phelps, on the occasion of his leaving Eng-

land; the Ministry, Opposition, the Bar and Literature, were represented by their respective leaders.

24. Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., appeared at Clonmel to answer charges under the Crimes Act. After a stormy sitting the magistrates ordered the Court to be cleared, and Mr. O'Brien escaped in the disorder which ensued.

— The Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 4 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

25. At a meeting held at the Birmingham Town Hall, and presided over by Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., Lord Wolseley advocated military conscription in this country.

— The British ship *W. White*, which had been abandoned off Delaware Bay in the famous blizzard of March 3, 1887, drifted ashore on the island of Lewis, one of the Western Hebrides. When she was abandoned her masts were standing, some sails set, and distress signals flying; she was frequently sighted by numerous ships and steamers, and it was ascertained that on one occasion she had drifted 1,260 miles in eighty-four days.

27. General Boulanger elected for Paris (Department of the Seine) by 244,070 votes over the Ministerial and Radical candidate, M. Jacques, who polled 162,520 votes. About 27,000 votes were lost on other candidates, and out of 568,697 electors 435,860 recorded their votes.

29. Mr. W. O'Brien, for whose arrest a warrant had been issued after his disappearance at Clonmel, kept his promise to attend a meeting of the constituents of Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., in Manchester. On reaching Carrick-on-Suir from Clonmel Mr. O'Brien had driven to Wexford (ninety miles), where he embarked on board a collier, and landed on 27th at Porthcawl, Glamorganshire. Thence he reached London, and travelled down to Manchester unrecognised. After addressing the meeting he intended to give himself up quietly to the police. Some adherents, however, attempted a rescue, which proved fruitless.

— Serious disturbances took place in Buda-Pesth when the results of the vote on the Army Bill became known. M. Tisza, the Hungarian Premier, was the chief object of the demonstrations of the Radical party.

30. The Archduke Rudolph, Crown Prince of Austria, shot himself in a fit of temporary insanity at his shooting-box at Meyerling, near Vienna. It was some hours before his death was known, even by those in the house with him.

— A burglary was committed at "Ramslade," near Ascot, occupied by Mr. White, the Secretary of the American Legation, whilst the family were at dinner. Jewellery, valued at nearly 7,000*l.*, was carried off.

31. The Bank of England lowered its rate of discount from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent., the total reserve being about $14\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and the coin and bullion 21,616,762*l.*

FEBRUARY.

2. The Château of Chenonceaux, built for Diane de Poitiers, sold for the benefit of the creditors of Madame Wilson for 400,000 frs.

— A railway accident, involving the loss of fourteen lives and serious injuries to fifty others, took place on the line between Brussels and Namur.

The train from Brussels ran off the line near Gronendael and dashed against the brickwork of a bridge, which fell upon the front part of the train.

3. District-Inspector Martin of the Irish Constabulary killed by a stone thrown at him whilst arresting Father McFadden at Gweedore, co. Donegal.

— The ancient Gothic Church of Hammer, Flintshire, noted for its carved oak and stained windows, totally destroyed by fire caused by over-heating of the flues. The parish church of Arbuthnot, Kincardineshire, also destroyed in the same way.

4. Serious gales and snowstorms reported round the coasts and from many inland places, causing great damage to buildings and shipping. Two large ships came into collision off Dungeness, and both sank with twenty-three men.

— An order issued by the Lord Chamberlain authorising the wearing of high dresses by ladies attending the early Drawing-Rooms held by the Queen.

— The Scotch action for libel by Mr. Parnell against the *Times* dismissed by Lord Kinnear in the Court of Session for want of jurisdiction.

— A riot took place at Chinkiang, on the Yangtze river, in the course of which a large portion of the Foreign Settlement was destroyed, the British Consulate burnt to the ground, and the United States Consulate looted. The disturbance arose out of the bad blood between the Scotch police employed by the Foreign Concession and the native officers.

5. The election of Aldermen by the County Council of London resulted in the voting of the entire "Progressist" list, with one exception—the Earl of Meath being chosen from the Moderates. Three names appeared on both lists.

— The Crown Prince of Austria buried with simple state in the Capucin Church of Vienna; the members of the Imperial family only attending in person. The European sovereigns were represented by their ambassadors. In the various European capitals funeral services were held, at which representatives or members of the reigning families were present.

— The barque *Largo Bay* picked up in a disabled state off Beachey Head, having been in collision with a large steamer of the Glen line, the *Glencoe*, 3,000 tons, which was supposed to have sunk immediately with fifty-three hands on board.

6. Much excitement caused in military circles in France and Germany by the issue of an address by Colonel Sénart to his soldiers, referring in bitter terms to the refusal of the German Government to allow the French regimental doctor to visit his mother on her death-bed at Strasburg.

— Prince Alexander of Battenberg, formerly ruler of Bulgaria, privately married at Castellar, near Mentone, to Fraulein Loisinger, an accomplished singer at the Dresden and Darmstadt opera-houses.

7. The London School Board budget showed that the average attendance of children was 354,704, as compared with 328,405 in the previous year. The total net cost of education of each child was 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*, or a total cost of 580,219*l.* In consequence of the anticipated economies of the previous years not having been effected, a school rate of 8½*d.*, as compared with 8*d.*, in the pound was declared to be necessary. The net expenditure of the year 1888-89 had been 1,095,801*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*

7. A serious fire broke out in the store-houses of Ward's Wharf, Lambeth, which at one time threatened to assume alarming proportions. Happily the efforts of the firemen were successful in limiting the damage to about 20,000*l*.

8. Serious disturbances in Rome caused by large numbers of Socialists and others out of employ.

— During a severe gale of wind the roof of a disused spinning mill at Little Lever, near Bolton, completely lifted off, and in falling caused the death of six persons, and injury to many others.

— The remains of certain British officers who fell at Waterloo removed from the cemetery in the Quartier Léopold of Brussels to Evère.

— The confiscation of the *Deutsche Rundschau* containing the Emperor Frederick's diary rescinded, and various proceedings against Dr. Gefloken and others abandoned.

9. Rev. Augustus Austen-Leigh elected Provost of King's College, Cambridge.

— Two men who had been entombed in consequence of a landslip in the Drakeswell Mine, near Tavistock, rescued unhurt after having been immured over one hundred hours, with only three pasties, and without light or water.

10. Severe snowstorms general over Europe and the British Isles, creating great delay in telegraph and railway business, and the loss of several lives.

— In spite of the weather, which in London was as severe as elsewhere, nearly 10,000 persons assembled in Hyde Park to protest against the treatment of the Irish political prisoners.

— A slight shock of earthquake passed through the district between Manchester, Bolton, and Ashton-under-Lyne, lasting several seconds, but doing no damage.

11. A Constitution on the German model proclaimed in Japan, and a responsible ministry with two chambers of legislature appointed. The Minister of Education, who had been one of the strongest advocates of constitutional government, was assassinated by a half-crazy priest on returning from the ceremony at which the Constitution had been proclaimed.

12. At the second meeting of the London County Council, Lord Rosebery elected Chairman, Sir John Lubbock Vice-Chairman, and Mr. J. F. B. Firth, M.P., Deputy-Chairman.

— The trial of Dr. King, Bishop of Lincoln, opened at Lambeth Palace before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, and Salisbury. The proceedings were merely formal, and the Court adjourned for a month.

— Two collisions occurred on the Belgian railway system, one at Maubeuge between the express train from Paris and that from Brussels, but luckily only one person was killed, the other near Petange between a goods train and a passenger train, when two workmen were killed and twenty-four others seriously injured.

13. A portion of the buildings composing the turkey-red dyeing works of Messrs. Orr, Ewing & Co., at Levenbank, near Glasgow, took fire and damaged to the extent of 30,000*l*.

— Two political meetings held simultaneously at Glasgow—Mr. Cham-

berlain addressing the one and Sir George Trevelyan the other. At Portsmouth Mr. John Morley addressed a large gathering.

13. The "Free Cossack" Atchinoff, who, with about 150 followers, had landed at and occupied Sagallo, near Obock, in the Red Sea, bombarded by the French. Five Cossacks were killed and many wounded, and the remainder embarked under the supervision of a Russian naval officer, and conveyed to Odessa.

14. The French Chamber of Deputies, by 307 to 218, rejected the proposed revision of the Constitution, to which M. Floquet had pledged himself, and the Ministry at once resigned.

— The Empress-Regent of China, on retiring from her function, issued a decree ennobling three generations of the ancestors of Sir Robert Hart, the head of the Chinese Customs Department.

15. The post-office at Chartres wrecked by an explosion of gas, by which all the employés, sixteen in number, were more or less seriously injured.

— Distraint notices for long outstanding arrears of rent served on certain tenants of the Hawarden estate, who were ultimately ejected from their holdings.

— After terrible privations and disasters, Lord Lonsdale and his party reached Kodiack Island, off the coast of Alaska, having made their way from the mouth of the Kuskewri river across the Alaskan peninsula. Lord Lonsdale, early in the march, was disabled by falling into a crevice, and his hip dislocated.

16. The Bishopric of St. Asaph conferred upon the Rev. A. G. Edwards, vicar of St. Peter's, Carmarthen.

— The reformatory ship, *Cumberland*, lying in the Clyde, caught fire, which extended so rapidly that the boys on board—upwards of 400—had some difficulty in saving themselves by swimming to the shore. Four of the boys were arrested for incendiarism. The *Cumberland* had been built in 1780, and formed part of Lord Rodney's squadron.

18. The Park Central Hotel at Hartford, Connecticut, completely wrecked by the explosion of a boiler on the basement floor. About eighty persons were on the premises, and of these twenty-five were killed by the explosion or by the fire which afterwards enveloped the building. Many others were seriously injured.

— A disastrous cyclone passed over the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Virginia, wrecking buildings and farmhouses, and causing the death of several persons.

— Severe and prolonged shocks of earthquake felt at Yokohama and Tokio, and considerable damage done to property in the latter place.

19. A great Liberal demonstration held at the Edinburgh Corn Exchange, presided over by the Earl of Rosebery, and attended by upwards of 4,000 persons.

— Sir John Kinloch (Gladstonian) returned for East Perthshire by 4,005 votes, his opponent, Mr. Boase (Conservative), polling 2,289 votes.

20. The Conference Committee appointed by Congress agreed to the admission of four new States into the Union—North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington and Montana—thus raising the number to forty-two.

— The marriage of the Duke of Newcastle with Miss K. F. Candy solemnised at All Saints', Margaret Street, the Bishop of Lincoln officiating in full canonicals.

— The Czar and Czarina, attended by upwards of twenty members of the Imperial family, attended a grand ball given by Sir Robert Morier, the English Ambassador at St. Petersburg.

21. The fourth session of the twelfth Parliament of the present reign opened by Royal Commission.

— After numerous unsuccessful attempts by M. Méline and others, M. Tirard succeeded in forming a Cabinet, in which the Opportunists held several seats.

— In the fifth round of running for the Waterloo Cup, the two dogs left were Colonel North's Fullerton and Mr. Badger's Troughend, but also belonging to Colonel North. The stakes were, therefore, divided. Both dogs were by Greentick.

22. The state of the Nile gave rise to great apprehension as to the water supply of the year. At Assouan the gauge only registered fifty inches of water, whereas in 1878, the lowest Nile ever witnessed, seventy inches were registered at the same date.

— Immense quantities of snow fell in the Bernese Oberland and other parts of Central Europe, and Hungary was visited by severe thunderstorms, involving serious loss of life.

23. At Hayti the Général Légitime's gunboat *Dessalines* bombarded Gonnaives, but without success, and was ultimately driven off by the land forts.

25. The Seine at Paris suddenly rose to a considerable height above its ordinary level, inundating Bercy and other low-lying suburbs, and causing considerable damage to property.

— The village of Celliez, near Embrun, almost totally destroyed by fire; 250 of the villagers were rendered homeless, and property to the value of 700,000 francs was destroyed.

— Richard Pigott, from whom the *Times* had obtained the alleged letters of Mr. Parnell and others, which formed the basis of the articles "Parnellism and Crime," disappeared from London, his evidence having altogether broken down. A warrant for his apprehension on charges of perjury and forgery was, on the meeting of the Commission, moved for by Sir C. Russell.

26. The Royal Circus, Manchester, a structure mostly in wood, entirely destroyed by fire, at the close of the performance of the Wild West Show.

— The Emperor of China married with great solemnity to the Yeh-ho-na-la, daughter of Deputy Lieut.-Gen. Knei-Hsiang. It was estimated that the marriage rites and ceremonies involved an expenditure of 1,250,000*l*.

27. Before the Parnell Commission, Pigott's confession of forgery having been read, the Attorney-General, on behalf of the *Times*, withdrew unreservedly the case founded upon the forged letters.

— Mr. S. J. Balfour (G.L.) returned unopposed for Burnley, in the room of Mr. T. S. Slagg (G.L.).

— A frightful railway accident occurred near St. George, on the Great

Western division of the Grand Trunk Line of Canada. Three cars of an express train went over a high embankment, and ten persons were killed and thirty injured.

27. The application for shares in the Burma Ruby Mine Company, launched by Messrs. Rothschild, gave rise to an extraordinary scene, enormous and excited crowds blocking all approaches to the offices.

28. At the annual winter meeting of the National Rifle Association, Lord Wantage announced that the Council had finally selected Brookwood, or Bisley Common, near Woking, as the site for the meeting of the Association.

— Dr. Dollinger received congratulatory telegrams on his ninetieth birthday from the leading members of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, including the Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury.

— The *Ligue des Patriotes*, of which M. Déroulède was the head, suppressed by order of the French Ministry, in consequence of a manifesto sympathising with the Russian people in the Atchinoff incident. The papers of the society were seized, and several of the Committee, who were not protected by their being deputies, were arrested.

MARCH.

1. Mr. John Morley's amendment on the Address negatived after four nights' debate by 339 to 260 votes.

— The fiftieth anniversary of Dr. Joachim's appearance as a violinist celebrated with great enthusiasm throughout Germany. The musician received at the hands of the Minister of Public Worship the grand gold medal for art, and an address signed by the leading persons of Germany, and accompanied by a sum of 100,000 marks, whilst congratulatory telegrams arrived from all parts of the world.

— Richard Pigott, who had played an important part before the Parnell Commission, committed suicide in Madrid, whither he had been tracked by the police.

— After leaving the House of Commons, escorted by a number of friends, Dr. Tanner was quietly arrested at the Westminster Palace Hotel, and conveyed to Scotland Yard.

2. At a Council held at Windsor Castle, the Queen received two Zambesi chiefs, the bearers of a special message from the African king Lobengula.

— A serious fire broke out at the Government Military Stores at Weedon, and continued burning for nearly two days, destroying upwards of 100,000*l.* worth of small arms, accoutrements, and other munitions.

3. An attempt by the Socialists to hold a meeting on the Thames Embankment, and subsequently in Trafalgar Square, foiled by the police, who, having received notice of their intention, held both places in force.

4. President Harrison took the oath, and installed in the White House, Washington, as President of the United States, with the usual ceremonial.

— Mr. John Dillon, M.P., by the advice of his doctors, left England for Australia to restore his health.

5. M. Denfert-Rochereau, manager of the *Comptoir d'Escompte*, in Paris,

committed suicide, in consequence of the losses entailed upon that company by its speculating in copper.

5. The Imperial Theatre at St. Petersburg, which had been closed for some time previous to its being handed over to the St. Petersburg Conservatorio, discovered to have been stripped of all its costly fittings and decorations, even the marble staircase and parquet flooring having been removed.

6. Milan Obrenovitch, King of Servia, announced his abdication in favour of his son in the Konak of Belgrade, in the presence of his Ministers and the Diplomatic Body.

— The Queen left Portsmouth *en route* for Cherbourg and Biarritz in the s.s. *Victoria and Albert*, having slept on board the previous night.

— In the House of Commons the debate on the Address brought to an end by the application of the closure.

— The three men charged with burglary and attempted murder at Muswell Hill tried at the Old Bailey, found guilty, and sentenced to penal servitude for life. One of the prisoners, Clarke, pleaded guilty, and gave evidence against his confederates, Lyster and Burdell.

7. H.M. ship *Sullan*, a screw-armoured battle-ship of the second class, went ashore at Comerio, a small island between Malta and Gozo, and had to be abandoned by her crew.

— The express train reaching Holyhead Station at five a.m. had a narrow escape. The automatic brake refusing to act, the train dashed into the station at a high rate of speed on to the stop blocks of the terminus. There were only a few passengers at the back of the train, and these escaped with a severe shaking.

— In the House of Commons Lord G. Hamilton, as First Lord of the Admiralty, brought forward his proposal for the increase of the Navy by seventy ships, and at a cost of twenty-one millions sterling.

8. Earls Spencer and Rosebery and Mr. Parnell entertained by the Eighty Club at Willis' Rooms.

— After a long sitting, lasting throughout the greater part of the night, the French Minister of Finance, M. Rouvier, promised to advance 100 millions of francs to the Comptoir d'Escompte, on the understanding that the great credit and banking societies of France would guarantee any eventual losses up to twenty millions.

— Serious floods occurred in many parts of England by the sudden thaw following upon heavy falls of snow. Leicestershire, North Warwickshire, and parts of Gloucestershire suffered considerably, but the Vale of Taunton, as far as Exeter, was the scene of the greatest destruction of property, the Great Western Railway being rendered impassable near Durston.

9. The banishment of the Duc d'Aumale, decreed in July, 1886, annulled by the French Ministry, and subsequently endorsed by the Chamber.

— Sir Julian Pauncefote, K.C.M.G., Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office, appointed Minister at Washington, in succession to Lord Sackville.

— In a billiard match with Mr. Cook, spot stroke barred, Mr. J. Roberts, junr., made a remarkable break of 690, including fifty-nine consecutive canons.

11. Lord Compton (G.L.) elected for the Barnsley division of Yorkshire by 6,882 votes over Mr. Bruce Wentworth (C.), who polled 3,781 votes.

— Presidents Krüger (Transvaal) and Reitz (Orange Free State) signed a treaty of commercial union and defensive alliance in the event of either territory being attacked.

12. The Duc d'Aumale, who had arrived at Chantilly on the previous day, reached Paris, and, after calling on the President of the Republic, attended a meeting of his colleagues of the French Academy, by whom, irrespective of party, he was warmly welcomed.

— The rival American teams of baseball players played at the Kennington Oval in presence of the Prince of Wales and about 8,000 spectators.

— An engagement took place near Metemneh between the dervishes of El Senoun and the Abyssinians, in which the latter were completely routed, and the Negus, King John, was killed. King Menelek of Shoa at once declared himself Negus.

13. The Parnell Commission suspended its sittings for a fortnight on the close of the case presented by the *Times*, to enable the other side to arrange its course of action.

— A terrible colliery accident took place at the Broughton Colliery, near Wrexham, by which twenty lives were lost, and many others engaged in the pit were injured.

— The Prince of Wales presided at the twenty-first anniversary of the foundation of the Royal Colonial Institute, the banquet being attended by representatives from most of the British colonies.

14. At a conference of the Radical Union held at St. James's Hall, under the presidency of Mr. John Morley, Mr. Parnell received an enthusiastic welcome, the whole assembly rising and cheering for several minutes. The object of the meeting was to protest against the treatment of political prisoners as ordinary criminals.

— The Austrian Government gave orders for the establishment of a corps of observation on the Servian frontier.

— The appeal lodged in the Swiss Federal Court by Miss Stirling of the Salvation Army against the sentence of imprisonment for 100 days, pronounced by the police at Orbe, dismissed.

15. In the Kennington division of the borough of Lambeth, after a keen contest in which both sides exerted themselves to the utmost, Mr. M. H. Beaufoy (G.L.) was elected by 4,069 votes against Mr. Beresford Hope (C.), who polled 3,439.

— On the strong representations of the French Minister of Finance, the Bank of France, in conjunction with the leading financial agencies of Paris, advanced to the Comptoir d'Escompte a further sum of forty millions of francs, in order to avoid the judicial liquidation of that establishment.

16. A hurricane broke over the Samoan islands in the South Pacific, where seven men-of-war were lying in the harbour of Apia. The English ship *Calliope* managed to steam out, and thus escaped with the loss of her anchor and boats, but of the German squadron, the *Adler* (four guns) and *Eber* (three guns) were totally wrecked, and the remaining ship, the *Olga* (twelve

guns), was beached, but was ultimately got off with little damage; of the American squadron, the *Trenton* and *Vardalia* were total losses, and the *Nipsic* was beached. The Germans lost ninety-six officers and men; and the Americans 104.

16. A royal warrant issued reconstituting the Honourable Artillery Company, and recognising nearly all their ancient privileges. Viscount de Vesci was appointed Lieutenant-Colonel in the place of the Duke of Portland, and Capt. Labalmondiere, R.A., adjutant.

17. General Boulanger, at a banquet given at Tours in his honour, declared that his only alliance was with Republicans, and that the National Party were determined to maintain the Republic.

18. Charles Parton, charged with having murdered a Mr. Fletcher in a cab in Manchester, by means of chloral, found guilty and sentenced to death.

— M. Antoine, for some time deputy for Metz in the Reichstag, having resigned his seat, applied for permission to resume his French nationality. He was received, on his arrival in Paris, with great enthusiasm by a large crowd assembled at the railway station.

— The Ursuline nuns of Thurles (Ireland) forwarded to Mr. Gladstone a cushion embroidered by their own hands. The crest and arms of Mr. Gladstone's family and several scenes of Irish life were worked on the cushion.

19. A fracas occurred in the Parliament House at Buda-Pesth, arising out of a charge of robbery in connection with railway contracts, made by Baron Eötvös against M. Tisza, the Prime Minister. Great excitement ensued, and on the adjournment of the House a student violently abused and assaulted a ministerial deputy as he was leaving the House. The deputy drew a revolver and shot the student, slightly wounding him in the leg. A popular demonstration was made, the Liberal Club was mobbed by the students, and the Minister's carriage pelted with mud.

— Mr. Perceval Spencer having undertaken to make a parachute descent from a balloon let loose on the Calcutta racecourse, owing to a failure of gas the balloon would not rise. Mr. Spencer cut free the parachute, and the balloon shot up into the air, without any apparatus for regulating its descent. It was soon lost to sight, and eventually, having reached an altitude of 18,000 feet, the balloon began to descend, and Mr. Spencer at last alighted without injury on a small island in the Sunderbunds, about forty miles from Barasut.

20. The powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works summarily terminated, and transferred to the London County Council, some days previous to its prescribed dissolution; the Board having occupied itself during its last sittings in conferring pensions on its officers, and pledging the public credit for uncommenced undertakings.

— A strong local shock of earthquake, lasting several seconds, felt at Smyrna.

— Serious rioting, attended by looting and loss of life, broke out at Georgetown, Demerara, and spread to Charlestown and Albany's Town. The negroes rose in consequence of a report that one of their race had been killed by the Portuguese. The disturbances were renewed for several days, but on the arrival of a ship-of-war order was restored.

21. In the French Chamber of Deputies, M. Laur, supported by the Boulangists, called upon the Government to prosecute the Rothschilds and other great financiers who had attempted to create a monopoly in copper.

21. Lord Carnarvon's Bill for reforming the House of Lords (Discontinuance of Writs) rejected on the second reading by 73 to 14 votes.

— An outbreak of fire, which at one time threatened to become serious, took place on board H.M. ship *Blake*, building in Chatham dockyard.

— A French torpedo boat, on its way from Le Havre to Brest, capsized in a gale, and all hands, fourteen in number, were lost. Almost at the same time a similar accident took place off Toulon, the torpedo boat sinking in seventeen fathoms of water.

22. In the House of Commons Sir Wm. Harcourt made an attack, which was practically a vote of censure, on the Attorney-General (Sir R. Webster) for his conduct of the Parnell case. The motion to reduce the Attorney-General's salary, after a bitter debate, defeated by 286 to 206 votes.

— The election for the Gorton Division of Lancashire resulted in the return of Mr. William Mather (G.L.) by 5,155 over Mr. E. F. G. Hatch (C.), who polled 4,309 votes.

23. The citadel of Halifax (N.S.) greatly damaged by a fire which originated in a chimney flue. The fire spread rapidly, but, by dint of great efforts, the powder magazine and shed containing the big guns were saved.

— The first free ferry on the Thames, plying between North and South Woolwich, opened by the London County Council, under the presidency of Lord Rosebery.

— The town of Linsk, in the Government of Minsk, almost entirely destroyed by fire, supposed to be the work of incendiaries. Eighty-four persons lost their lives.

25. The new headquarters of the Artists' Volunteers (7th Middlesex), near Euston Square, opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales, a grand muster of the corps being held.

— The funeral of Count Peter Schouvaloff, at one time ambassador to England, and subsequently Minister of the Interior, celebrated with great pomp at St. Petersburg, the Czar and Czarina taking part in the ceremonies.

— Strong shocks of earthquake felt at Albania in the district of Granada.

26. A State banquet, at which the Prince of Wales presided, given by order of the Queen at St. James's Palace, to the members of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, in celebration of its jubilee.

— Prince Ferdinand, of Hohenzollern, nephew of King Charles, proclaimed heir to the Roumanian throne.

— In the second chamber of the States-General the Premier announced that the King of the Netherlands was no longer capable of carrying on public business.

— The Emperor of Germany attended Prince Bismarck's Parliamentary dinner, having invited himself in a wholly informal fashion on the previous day.

27. A meeting between Queen Victoria and the Queen-Regent of Spain took place at St. Sebastian, being the first recorded visit of an English sovereign to Spain. The Queen was received with great cordiality by the Spanish, and with marked attention by the Queen-Regent.

— The Lincolnshire Handicap won by Sir R. Jardine's *Wise Man*, 4 yrs., 7 st. 8 lbs. (T. Loates), by half a length, defeating a field of twenty-six starters.

27. In the House of Commons the second reading of Mr. J. Stevenson's Sunday Closing Bill carried by 179 to 157 votes.

— Mr. Gladstone attended the funeral of his brother, Sir Thomas Gladstone, Bart., of Fasque, Kincardineshire.

28. The Baltic wharf, Pimlico, used as a timber-yard, totally destroyed by fire, with all its contents.

— Mr. Robert Lincoln, son of President Lincoln, appointed United States Minister to England; but the Senate refused to confirm the President's nomination of Mr. Halstead to the Berlin Legation.

29. At Liverpool the Grand National Steeplechase won by Mr. M. A. Mabor's Frigate, aged, 11 st. 4 lbs. (Mr. T. Beasley), defeating a field of twenty starters.

— The Ostend Mail packet, *Comtesse de Flandre*, on her voyage to Dover, run into by the returning packet-ship *Princess Henrietta*, off Dunkerque. The *Comtesse de Flandre* at once filled with water, and her boilers burst, killing the captain and fifteen others. Prince Napoleon, coming *incognito* to England, as Comte de Montcaliemo, was among the passengers. He and his secretary, Baron Brunet, escaped, but his valet was drowned.

— The Oxford and Cambridge boat race resulted in the victory of Cambridge by about three lengths. Cambridge having won the toss took the Surrey side, led from nearly the start, and was never headed. Time, 20 min. 14 sec. The names and weights of the crews were as follows:—

| CAMBRIDGE. | | OXFORD. | |
|---|---------|--|---------|
| | st. lb. | | st. lb. |
| 1. R. H. Symonds-Taylor, Trinity Hall | 10 10½ | 1. H. E. L. Puxley, Corpus | 11 8½ |
| 2. L. Hannen, Trinity Hall | 11 4 | 2. R. P. Rowe, Magdalen | 11 9 |
| 3. R. H. P. Orde, First Trinity | 11 10 | 3. T. A. Cook, Wadham | 12 2 |
| 4. C. B. P. Bell, Trinity Hall | 13 1 | 4. F. C. Drake, New College | 12 12 |
| 5. S. D. Muttelbury, Thrd Trin. | 13 9 | 5. Lord Ampthill, New College. | 12 11 |
| 6. P. Landale, Trinity Hall | 12 8 | 6. H. R. Parker, Brasenose | 13 11 |
| 7. F. H. Mangham, Trinity Hall | 11 5½ | 7. G. Nickalls, Magdalen | 12 5 |
| J. C. Gardner, Emmanuel (stroke) | 11 10 | W. F. C. Holland, Brasenose (stroke) | 10 12 |
| T. W. Northmore, Queens' (cox.) | 7 13 | J. F. Heywood-Lonsdale, New College (cox.) | 8 2½ |

30. Mr. John Bright buried with great simplicity in the cemetery of the George Street Meeting-house at Rochdale. The funeral was, however, attended by representatives of every class of society, from the Queen to the humblest mill-hands and labourers, and of all shades of political opinion. Business of all kinds was suspended at Rochdale and the neighbourhood, and the funeral was attended by upwards of 40,000 persons.

— Captain H. F. Bowles (Conservative) elected for the Enfield Division of Middlesex by 5,124 votes, against Mr. Fairbairns (G.L.), who polled 3,612 votes.

— A passenger train from Sheffield to London, with a large number of excursionists, ran off the rails at Huddersfield Junction, near Penistone. One person was killed and twelve others seriously wounded.

31. At the church of San Carlo, in Rome, during a sermon by the Franciscan monk, Padre Agostino, a bomb was thrown from behind the high altar into the body of the church, where it burst, creating a serious panic. After a few minutes' interval the preacher continued his sermon.

APRIL.

1. A Parliamentary return moved for by Mr. Gladstone showed that in the thirty years ended with 1887, there had been brought into the divorce court 2,784 petitions for judicial separation, of which 985 were successful and 385 were dismissed; there were 10,651 petitions for divorce or dissolution of marriage, of which 7,321 were successful and 812 dismissed. There were 3,892 which never came to a hearing; and in 294 the Queen's Proctor intervened, and in 236 obtained reversals of the decree.

— The Inter-University racquet match won by Cambridge by four games to one.

— News reached England of Mr. H. Stanley's safety up to September 4, 1888, after his return from a stay with Emin Pasha. One part of his journey, occupying 160 days, was through a swampy forest, affording no means of subsistence of any kind.

— General Boulanger, acting on the advice of his friends, suddenly and secretly left Paris for Brussels, whence he addressed a manifesto to his party, stating that he had quitted France to avoid arrest, the Government having decided to take that step.

— The Queen left Biarritz, and travelled by way of Cherbourg and Portsmouth, leaving at once for Windsor, which was reached in less than twenty-four hours.

8. A foot-bridge erected over the Trent at Burton at a cost of about 8,000*l.*, to take the place of the existing ferry, handed over to the town by Lord Burton.

— The territory of Dakota visited by severe hurricanes and sandstorms, in the midst of which the prairie was set on fire in several places, and enormous losses inflicted upon life and property.

4. After a tumultuous and disorderly debate the French Chamber agreed to the prosecution of General Boulanger for conspiracy against the Republic by 353 to 192.

— The House of Lords elected the Earl of Morley—proposed by Earl Granville—to be its Chairman of Committees by 95 votes to 77 given to Lord Balfour of Burleigh—proposed by the Marquess of Salisbury.

— M. Henri Meilhac, the author of numerous lively comedies and opéra-bouffes, received at the French Academy by M. Jules Simon.

5. Mr. A. J. Balfour visited Birmingham and succeeded in healing the breach between the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, arising out of Lord R. Churchill's refusal to contest the seat for West Birmingham, and persuaded the sections to unite in support of Mr. A. Bright.

6. The Duchess of Cambridge, who had survived her husband thirty-nine years, died at St. James's Palace in her ninety-second year.

— The leading members of the *Ligue des Patriotes* acquitted by the Police Correctionnelle of the charge of belonging to a secret society, but fined the nominal sum of 100 francs each for belonging to an unauthorised society.

— At Leicester a new race, the Prince of Wales' Stakes, value 12,000*l.*,

run for the first time and won by the Duke of Portland's colt Donovan, 9 st. (F. Barrett). Seventeen started.

6. A destructive fire destroyed nearly one-third of the flourishing city of Surat, rendering upwards of 15,000 people homeless. The fire broke out almost simultaneously in several places.

7. A serious outbreak of yellow fever took place at Rio de Janeiro and other towns on the Brazil coast.

8. A frightful murder, only equalled by those committed in Whitechapel, perpetrated on a moor on the outskirts of Hamburg on a boy only ten years of age. The murderer, although surprised by several persons, managed to escape, but was eventually captured.

— A gentleman, subsequently identified as Captain W. G. Hunt, who had lodgings in Kentish Town with an actress, after a violent altercation shot her and afterwards himself.

— Captain Rice, R.N., acquitted by the Court Martial of negligence in the wreck of H.M. Ship *Sultan*, censured for want of foresight.

9. The French Chamber passed the Bill authorising the Senate to try General Boulanger and others.

— In the House of Commons Dr. Clarke's Bill for granting Home Rule to Scotland rejected on the second reading by 200 to 79 votes.

10. A banquet given to Mr. W. H. Smith (First Lord of the Treasury) at Merchant Taylors' Hall by the leading merchants, bankers, &c., of the city of London.

— Thomas Allen, a Zulu, executed at Swansea for the murder of the landlord of the hotel which he had attempted to rob.

— Father Joseph Damien, who for several years had devoted himself to the lepers of the South Sea Islands, died at Molokai from the disease, contracted in his work. During his sixteen years of self-expatriation he built two churches and attended the death-beds of 2,000 lepers.

11. The Duke of Nassau took the oath to the Luxembourg Constitution before the Chamber, all the proceedings being carried on in French.

— The London County Council, after a prolonged debate, passed a resolution, moved by Lord Lingen, in favour of the ultimate transfer of the control of the Metropolitan police to that body.

— A disastrous fire took place at Brooklyn which destroyed Messrs. Buchanan's jute factory, and occasioned a panic among the women and boys, three hundred in number, employed there. The damage done was valued at half a million of dollars.

12. Sir Charles Russell closed his eight days' speech before the Parnell Commission, in which he gave a history of Irish politics since Mr. Parnell's appearance as a public man.

— The Arnold Memorial Committee met at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, under the presidency of Archdeacon Farrar, when it was announced that 6,840*l.* had been received, including 1,000*l.* from America.

13. The funeral of H.R.H. the Duchess of Cambridge took place at Kew Church. The Queen and the members of the Royal Family, and the repre-

representatives of foreign powers connected with the deceased, were present, but the ceremony was conducted with complete simplicity.

18. The body of the Marquess of Ely, who had died at Nice, cremated at Woking in accordance with the directions of his will.

— Mr. Justice Stephen and Mr. Baron Huddleston, in the case of *Beresford Hope v. Sandhurst*, decided that Lady Sandhurst was incapacitated from sitting on the London County Council, and awarded the seat to the plaintiff.

— At the annual general meeting of the Bar, held at Lincoln's Inn Hall, a warm and marked reception was given to the Attorney-General (Sir R. Webster), who presided.

— A young Belgian named Robert Feron shot his sweetheart in a first-class railway carriage whilst travelling between Nottingham and Trent stations, and then committed suicide. No alarm was given, and the tragedy was only discovered by the ticket-collector at the end of the journey.

15. The election in Central Birmingham to fill the seat vacant by the death of Mr. John Bright resulted in the return of his son, Mr. J. A. Bright (L.U.), by 5,621 votes, Mr. W. Phipson Beale (G.L.) polling 2,561.

— In the House of Commons Mr. Goschen produced his third budget, in which he made further provision for the requirements of local government and for the increased demands of the navy.

— The British Club at Biarritz, of which the foundation-stone had been laid in 1882 by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, completely destroyed by fire. There was no adequate supply of water.

— At St. James's Hall, after the close of the last Monday Popular Concert of the season, a testimonial in the shape of a "red" Stradivarius violin, dated 1710, presented to Herr Joachim in commemoration of the fiftieth year of his performing in public.

16. At Rochester the Hon. E. Knatchbull-Hugessen (G.L.) returned by 1,655 votes, against Alderman H. D. Davies (C.), who polled 1,580.

— At the Birchgrove Colliery, Swansea Valley, an inrush of water from some old workings caused the death of four men working in the pit.

— Rev. James Pulleine nominated to the suffragan see of Richmond, in the diocese of Ripon, in lieu of the suffragan see of Penrith, as originally named.

17. The Archbishops of Paris, Lyons and Bordeaux, and Malines (Mechlin), received notification of their elevation to the Cardinalate.

— Lord Hartington, previous to addressing a large meeting of Liberal Unionists at Sunderland, laid the memorial stone of the Hartley wing of the Infirmary. During the ceremony a crowded platform gave way, and many ladies and gentlemen were injured.

18. A petard exploded behind the high altar in Valencia Cathedral during the "Tenebræ" services, but beyond damaging the base of a pillar and alarming the congregation did little actual harm. It was subsequently stated that the explosion had been caused by pickpockets, who hoped to profit by the confusion.

— The Bank of England lowered its rate of discount to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the

stock of bullion standing at 21,287,995*l.*, and the reserve, 18,985,000*l.*, being 40½ per cent. of the liabilities.

19. A fire broke out at New York in Messrs. Wilcox's lard refinery, and extended for half a mile along the river front before it could be checked. Several storehouses, two elevators, and much dock property, valued at three millions of dollars, were destroyed. Two lives only were lost, but several persons were injured.

21. A strike of the tramcar drivers took place in Vienna, which subsequently took the form of serious street rioting. The police and troops who were called out to restore order and to protect the drivers willing to work at their old wages, were maltreated by the strikers, many of whom were subsequently arrested.

— At Minneapolis (U.S.A.), also, a similar strike took place, the tramcar men tearing up the tracks and defying the police.

22. Volunteer manoeuvres took place at Eastbourne, Dover, Portsmouth, and Aldershot, but as a rule only the local forces and a few regiments from London took part in the exercises.

— Oldahama, in the Indian territory, on the outskirts of Kansas, thrown open for settlers by the United States. Previous to the formal opening of the country many thousands of people reached the frontier, and for miles the tracks were covered by unbroken lines of wagons. Within twenty-four hours the town of Guthrie was founded, and a bank and newspaper started; but its existence was short, and fightings and violence prevailed throughout the new region.

23. The Lord Provost's Council of Edinburgh, after a long discussion, finally agreed, by 24 votes to 18, to offer the freedom of the city to Mr. C. S. Parnell, M.P.

— At the Epsom Spring Meeting the Great Metropolitan Stakes won by Mr. G. Fenwick's Tissaphernes, 5 yrs., 7 st. 9 lbs. (G. Barrett). Seven started.

24. General Boulanger, accompanied by M. Naquet, Count Dillon, &c., arrived in London from Brussels.

— The City and Suburban Handicap won by Mr. Leybourne's Gold-seeker, 4 yrs., 8 st. (T. Cannon, jun.), a complete outsider, defeating a field of nineteen starters.

— The National Liberal Union held its annual meeting at Birmingham, when the president, Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., Lord Derby and others, congratulated the members on the position of their party and its influence in politics.

26. After lasting the greater part of the week, and stirring up the seditious elements of the Socialist and the Anti-Semitic parties, the tramcar strike at Vienna came to an end. The company undertook to reduce the hours of their men's work, and to revise the scale of pay, which had been about 2*s.* per day of seventeen hours. The damage caused to the company and to private property by the rioters was estimated at 100,000 *fl.*, and in addition the company had to pay 50,000 *fl.* forfeit to the Town Council for interruption of traffic.

— Mr. Irving and Miss Ellen Terry performed in "The Bells" and the

"Merchant of Venice" before the Queen at Sandringham, and after the performance both received valuable marks of her Majesty's appreciation.

28. A train from Chicago, bound for New York, ran off the Grand Trunk line near Hamilton, Ontario. The engine left the line at a "frog," and plunged into a water tank. Two persons were killed outright, and four cars were overturned and subsequently caught fire—fifteen persons being burnt to death.

29. The public rejoicings to mark the centenary of General Washington's arrival in New York commenced with a grand naval parade in New York harbour; the President with all his Cabinet arrived from Washington and inaugurated the fêtes, which lasted three days.

— A balloon which had ascended from Borneville, Indiana, to a great height suddenly burst; but, although the wreckage and car fell with awful rapidity, the aeronaut, Strüt, was still alive, but seriously injured, when picked up.

— Señor Corroma, a Spanish journalist and novelist, sentenced on the application of the Public Prosecutor by the Court of Barcelona to four months' imprisonment for publishing a libel on the Duke of Edinburgh.

80. At the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society at Exeter Hall the chair was occupied by the Bishop of Moosonee (Hudson's Bay diocese), who described himself as a blacksmith, a carpenter, and able to knit stockings.

MAY.

1. Railway communication between Brisbane and Adelaide completed by the opening of the steel bridge over the Hawkesbury river between Sydney and Newcastle, the largest structure of the kind in the southern hemisphere, and the third largest in the world—consisting of seven spans of 415 feet each.

— The Two Thousand Guineas Stakes won by Mr. Douglas Baird's Enthusiast, 9 st. (T. Cannon), defeating the favourite, Donovan, by a head, and seven other starters.

2. At a plenary sitting of both Houses of the States-General the King of Holland was, in view of his recovery, invited to resume the government of the country.

— A German police agent named Wohlgemuth arrested by the Swiss authorities at Rheinfelden, and expelled across the frontier as an *agent provocateur* in Socialist gatherings.

8. At Newmarket the One Thousand Guineas Stakes won by Mr. Vyner's Minthe (J. Woodburn). Fourteen started.

— The Syndic of Milan, accompanied by the representatives of certain learned societies, assisted at the opening of the tomb in the Certosa of Pavia, where Gian Galeazzo Visconti and his wife, Isabella of Valori, were supposed to have been interred. The relics and remains proved incontestably the truth of the tradition.

— In the House of Commons the Government defeated by 118 votes to 103 on the motion of Mr. Samuel Smith condemning the fiscal system of India as tending to foster intemperance.

4. At the Royal Academy banquet Lord Salisbury announced that an anonymous benefactor had offered to build a national portrait gallery on a site to be provided within a certain distance of Charing Cross. •

5. President Carnot, attended by his ministers, drove from Paris to Versailles, through a large and enthusiastic assembly, to celebrate the centenary of the meeting of the States-General summoned to Versailles by Louis XVI. As the President was leaving the Elysée a well-dressed man fired a pistol loaded with blank cartridge at M. Carnot. The assailant was subsequently found to have recently returned from Martinique with an alleged grievance, and had recently been suffering from illness.

6. The Paris Exhibition formally opened by the President of the Republic. None of the European monarchies were officially represented by their ambassadors, but the English and several other *chargés d'affaires* attended the ceremony.

— A serious fire broke out at the City Soap Works, Cripplegate, and shortly afterwards spread to the surrounding buildings in Milton Street and Moor Lane. Property to the value of more than 50,000*l.* was destroyed before the fire was mastered.

7. In the House of Commons the second reading of the Naval Defence Bill carried by 279 to 119 votes.

— The Princess of Wales laid the foundation-stone of the new Hospital for Women in the Euston Road, officered and attended by women.

8. The Prince of Wales unveiled in the courtyard of the University of London, Burlington Gardens, a statue of the Queen, executed by Mr. Boehm, R.A., erected in honour of her jubilee.

— The Inman steamer *City of Paris* reached New York, having made the voyage from Queenstown to Sandy Hook in 5 days 23 hours 7 minutes. Her longest run in one day was 511 knots—the highest on record.

— Morehead, a suburb of Chicago, almost totally destroyed by fire, occasioned by some boys who had thrown away their lighted cigars.

9. In the House of Lords the second reading of the Bill for legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister rejected by 147 to 120 votes.

— Captain Wissman attacked the Arab leader Bushiri with a large force of natives led by German officers, and after a sharp engagement forced the Arab malcontents to retire with considerable loss.

10. Widespread strikes, accompanied by riotous conduct, took place in the Westphalian coal districts, especially in the neighbourhood of Gladbach and Bochum, when upwards of 75,000 ceased working. The soldiers called upon to maintain order fired repeatedly on the miners, of whom several were killed.

— The Kempton Park Great Jubilee Stakes of 3,000 guineas, new mile course, won by General Byrne's Amphion, 3 yrs., 7 st., 1 lb. (Bradbury). Sixteen started.

— After a few days of intense and unseasonable heat, a cyclone burst upon the district lying between Chicago and Boston, being most severely felt round Pittsburg and Newhaven. At Williamsport (Penn.) Barnum's show was partially wrecked during a performance, and a panic ensued. Several public buildings were destroyed, and many persons injured. •

11. The Archbishop of Canterbury delivered judgment in his Court at Lambeth Palace in the case of *Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln* to the effect that the Archiepiscopal Court had power to hear the case promoted against the Bishop of Lincoln.

— The Kempton Park Royal Stakes of 10,000*l.*, 1½ mile, won by the Duke of Portland's Ayrshire, 4 yrs., 10 st. 1 lb. (J. Watts), defeating a field of seven starters, of which the favourite, Sir F. Johnstone's Friar's Balsam, was last but one.

12. At an early hour of the morning two gambling resorts—the Adelphi Club, Maiden Lane, Strand, and the Field Club, Park Place, St. James's—entered by the police, who took into custody all the occupants, including several noblemen and gentlemen; forty-seven at the former, and twenty at the latter place.

13. The report of the Royal Commission on the extension of the University of London unanimously recommended that the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons should not be authorised to grant degrees in medicine; and that it was desirable that London should have a teaching university. On the point whether University College or King's College should constitute, under charter, such university, the Commissioners were equally divided.

— Lord de Rothschild appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Bucks, the first instance of the office being held by a member of the Jewish faith.

14. The Lord Mayor brought his State visit to Paris to a close by a banquet given to the French ministers and municipal authorities.

15. The University of London conferred the degree of Doctor of Medicine for the first time upon a lady, Mrs. Scharheeb, of Manchester.

16. A serious fire which broke out in St. Laurence, a suburb of Quebec, destroyed nearly 700 houses, mostly of wood, before it could be checked. Five thousand people, mostly of the working class, were made homeless.

— The Court of Appeal unanimously affirmed the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, declared women incapable of holding municipal offices, and gave the seat on the London County Council (Brixton division) to Mr. Beresford Hope.

17. In the House of Commons Mr. Labouchere's resolution advocating the abolition of the system of hereditary legislature negatived by 201 to 160 votes.

— A serious conspiracy against the Czar discovered at St. Petersburg with ramifications at Moscow and Warsaw, at both of which places the regiments were alleged to have been compromised in the movement.

— A thunderstorm of extreme violence burst over Vienna and the surrounding country. In the city three persons were drowned whilst attempting to remove their goods from cellars, and one large street was rendered impassable by the subsidence of the soil. In the country districts upwards of fifty lives were lost.

18. The Queen went to Eton and laid the memorial stone of the new school buildings in Keate's Lane, which included a museum, laboratory, drawing school, lecture hall, and class-room, erected at a cost of about 80,000*l.*

— A banquet given in Paris by the representatives of thirteen American

republics to the members of the French Government. One American Government—that of Brazil—stood aloof. In reply to the invitation addressed to European Governments, only the representatives of Switzerland and Belgium attended.

20. Owing to a fog which had hung over the English Channel for several days the steamship *Beresford*, of West Hartlepool, steaming up Channel, ran into the steamship *The German Emperor*, causing the latter to sink in a few minutes, and six of the crew with her.

— The Chess Congress at New York resulted in the division of the first prize between Herr Weiss (Vienna) and M. Tschigorin, Mr. Gunsberg (World's Champion, London) taking the third prize.

21. The King of Italy arrived in Berlin on a visit to the German Emperor. The most lavish preparations had been made to receive the King with due honour.

— The Princess Beatrice of Battenberg safely delivered of a son.

— A meeting of Irish peers and members of Parliament, held under the presidency of the Marquess of Waterford, unanimously adopted a resolution recommending the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the appointment of a Secretary of State, and the maintenance in Dublin of a Royal residence.

— The Marquess of Salisbury presided over a meeting in connection with the Grand Habitation of the Primrose League at Her Majesty's Theatre, Haymarket, which was quite filled, chiefly by ladies. In his address Lord Salisbury stated that the number of the members had risen from 800,000 to 800,000.

— The steamship *City of Paris* arrived off Roche's Point from Sandy Hook, having made the voyage in 6 days 0 hrs. 30 min., the fastest passage on record, and bringing the largest number of passengers, 1,132, ever carried to Europe.

22. At the *soirée* of the Women's Liberal Federation held at the Grosvenor Gallery, after speeches by Mr. Parnell and others, a diamond bracelet was presented to Mrs. Gladstone by the Association, which was acknowledged by Mr. Gladstone.

— At the Newmarket Second Spring Meeting a new race, the Newmarket Stakes, of 7,500*l.*, for three-year-olds, colts, 9 st., 1½ mile, won by the Duke of Portland's Donovan (F. Barrett), defeating his own horse, The Turcophone (Watts), by two lengths, and a field of seventeen starters.

23. The body of Dr. Cronin, of Chicago, who had mysteriously disappeared from that city three weeks previously, found by the police, stripped and bearing the evidence of having been murdered.

— The strike in the coal districts of Westphalia practically closed by the concession by the masters of a general rise in wages. Strikes, however, continued in numerous other industries in Silesia, Berlin, and the Rhine provinces, in all cases for increase of pay and reduction of hours.

24. At Cardiff, after a spell of very hot weather, a shower of red rain fell, which in former times was regarded as the precursor of the plague.

— The Prince of Wales unveiled at the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons on the Thames Embankment a full-length statue of the Queen.

25. Some hours before daybreak a fire broke out at the Foreign Cattle Market, Deptford, and spread with amazing rapidity. After doing a considerable damage to the building and dead meat stored, the fire was extinguished after the main buildings had been destroyed.

— The Prince of Wales and members of the Royal Family were present at the Queen's Birthday "Trooping of the Colours" at the Horse Guards, and subsequently inspected the London Fire Brigade at the same place, on which occasion the crowd was so great that the Royal party had to take refuge in the Horse Guards, and thence to view the procession of fire-engines.

26. A serious riot attended with loss of life broke out at Belgrade, the ex-minister Garashanine and his Progressist friends being the objects of an armed attack by the mob, which the police was unable to keep in check.

— The King of Italy having completed his stay in Berlin, where he had been most warmly received by all classes, left, travelling by way of Frankfort and Lucerne.

27. Many districts in the Midlands submerged by the heavy rains of thunderstorms of the previous thirty-six hours, during which rain fell with little intermission.

— The Russian police discovered several secret societies, more or less Nihilist, one of which had for its object to bring about attempts on the lives of the Czar and other members of the Imperial Family.

28. Jean Perrin, who fired a blank cartridge at President Carnot on his way to the Versailles Centenary, sentenced to four months' imprisonment.

— The bodies of Lieut.-Col. the Hon. Sir Alex. Gordon, aide-de-camp to the Duke of Wellington at Waterloo, and of Capt. the Hon. H. Brudenell Forbes, of the 3rd Foot Guards, exhumed in the cemetery of St. Gilles, at Brussels, and subsequently placed beside the other Waterloo officers in the Evère Cemetery.

— At the meeting of the London County Council, Colonel Howard Vincent narrowly escaped, by 58 to 53, a vote of censure in respect of the defective arrangements for the Fire Brigade Review at the Horse Guards.

29. The Earl of Zetland appointed to the Viceroyalty of Ireland in succession to the Marquess of Londonderry.

— The freedom of the city of London presented to the Marquess of Dufferin, who subsequently attended a grand banquet given in his honour by the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House.

— The Czar at the betrothal of Princess Militza to his cousin, the Grand Duke Peter, toasted the Prince of Montenegro, as "the only sincere and loyal friend of Russia."

30. The "silver wedding" of the Comte and Comtesse de Paris celebrated with great rejoicings at East Sheen House, their actual residence.

— A thunderstorm of unusual violence raged at Hong Kong for three days with scarcely any intermission, causing immense damage to public and private property.

— Sharp shocks of earthquake felt on both sides of the English Channel, especially in the Isle of Wight and in the district between Portsmouth and Brighton, and as far north as London. At Guernsey and Cherbourg the

shocks were more violent than in England, and were also perceptible as far inland as Paris, but no damage was reported from any place.

31. The Queen held a review at Aldershot, at which above 11,500 men of all arms were present.

— Heavy rains, lasting for three days and exceeding four inches on the slopes of the Alleghanies, caused the sudden rise of the Susquehanna river and its tributaries. The most appalling results ensued. The Connemaugh valley on the western slope of the Alleghanies, dotted with numerous prosperous towns and villages, was completely devastated for a length of forty miles, the bursting of a large reservoir adding to the general deluge. It was estimated that upwards of 8,000 persons lost their lives, including at least 1,500 burnt to death at Johnstown, where the iron furnaces set fire to a mass of driftwood and buildings, temporarily stopped by the stone railway bridge across the Connemaugh river. In other parts of Virginia and Pennsylvania the freshets did enormous damage to life and property, estimated at \$40,000,000.

JUNE.

1. In the Court of Queen's Bench a judgment was given in the matter of the *recedos* of St. Paul's Cathedral for the issue of a mandamus compelling the Bishop of London to re-hear the complaint of the petitioners "with reference to all the circumstances of the case."

2. The French Derby, run at Chantilly, won by M. Edmond Blanc's Clover (F. Barzett), defeating the favourite by two lengths. Thirteen started.

— Lancashire and part of Cheshire visited by the heaviest thunderstorm ever known in the district. In Garstang district a shower of ice, some pieces measuring four inches in circumference, wrecked the windows and green-houses. Much property was destroyed in both counties, and many cattle killed by lightning. The storm passed over Scotland also, doing much harm near Dundee and Montrose.

3. The Queen, at Windsor Castle, in presenting new colours to the 2nd Battalion Princess Victoria's Royal Irish Fusiliers, referred to having already on two former occasions—viz. in 1833 and 1866—presented colours to the same regiment.

— President Carnot, after paying a visit to Arras, arrived at Calais to open with great ceremony the new harbour and the dock attached thereto. Upwards of forty millions of francs had been spent on the works, which would enable mail steamers of a large draught to enter the port at all states of the tide.

4. Proceeding to Boulogne the President inaugurated the "Digue Carnot," $1\frac{1}{2}$ mile long, constructed at a cost of 17,000,000 fr., and intended to protect the anchorage for ships of the Transatlantic lines.

— For the first time since her accession to the throne the Queen witnessed the "procession of boats" from Eton to Surly Hall, by which the anniversary of George III.'s birthday had been celebrated for so many years.

— A portion of the remains of a young woman horribly mutilated discovered in the Thames near Battersea, and further portions picked up elsewhere at intervals during the following days.

5. At Epsom the Derby Stakes won easily by the favourite, the Duke of Portland's Donovan (T. Loates), by a length and a half, defeating a field of thirteen starters, including Clover, the winner of the French Derby, who broke down badly and finished almost last.

— Mr. Gladstone commenced his southern and western campaign by an address at the Deanery Grounds, Southampton, and then continued his journey to the New Forest.

— The Theatre Royal, Burnley, totally destroyed by fire, after the conclusion of the performances. No lives were lost.

6. After two days of excessive heat, the thermometer standing at 83° in the shade and rising to 135° in the sun's rays, a thunderstorm of exceptional severity broke over London and the South-East district. The streets of Dover, Margate, and Salisbury were flooded, and great damage was done by the hailstones, which were of unusual size. At a few hours interval Madrid was also the centre of a thunderstorm of unusual violence, which occasioned enormous damage to the crops, and much injury to cattle and people.

— Seattle, one of the most thriving cities in Washington Territory, almost destroyed by a fire which originated in a turpentine store. Every bank, hotel, theatre, newspaper office, telegraph station was burned to the ground, and the steam-boat wharves and railroad stations completely gutted, and the area of the fire extended over sixty acres.

7. The Oaks Stakes at Epsom won by Lord R. Churchill's Abbess de Jouarre (J. Woodburn), a complete outsider, defeating the favourite, Mr. Vyner's Minthe, by a neck. Twelve started.

— Shocks of earthquake felt at Brest, in France, and New Bedford, Massachusetts.

— Captain Woodward, of H.M.S. *Duke of Wellington*, arrested at Portsmouth and subsequently bailed out of Winchester gaol for having neglected to make proper answer to a writ of *habeas corpus* issued by the Court of Queen's Bench in the case of a soldier named Floyd, falsely accused of having been a deserter from H.M.S. *Calliope*.

8. The French police seized, at the shop of M. Becker, a perfumer, three cases said to contain upwards of 80,000 letters, of a more or less compromising nature, addressed to General Boulanger; and subsequently M. Déroulède, M. Laisant, Laguerre, and others were arrested at Angoulême on the charge of attending a prohibited meeting of Boulangists in that town.

9. A violent gale, of the character of a cyclone, broke over the English Channel and caused much damage to trees, crops, and telegraph wires. It was followed by an exceptionally heavy fall of rain, which lasted with little intercession for thirty-six hours.

— The statue of Giordano Bruno, erected in the Campo dei Fiori, on the spot where he was burnt in 1600 by order of the Inquisition, unveiled in the presence of the Syndic of Rome, and an immense concourse of people from various districts of Italy.

10. The Shah of Persia arrived at Berlin, where he was received with great ceremony. After visiting the Emperor and Empress at Potsdam, he went to the Friedenskirche and deposited a laurel wreath with the Persian colours upon the coffin of the Emperor Frederick III.

10. The Prince and Princess of Wales visited the Paris Exhibition, and ascended to the top of the Eiffel Tower.

— The hearing of the action for libel, brought by Sir George Chetwynd against the Earl of Durham, referred by consent to the Stewards of the Jockey Club (Mr. J. Lowther, M.P., the Earl of March, and Prince Soltykoff), commenced in No. 5 Queen's Bench Court.

11. Mr. Gladstone having visited Weymouth, Torquay, and Dartmouth, arrived by yacht at Falmouth, where he had a most remarkable and enthusiastic reception from the miners of the surrounding districts.

— The coroner's jury empanelled to inquire into the death of Dr. Cronin, at Chicago, found that he was murdered by a conspiracy, and pointed to the United Brotherhood, or Clan-na-Gael, as the probable instigators. Numerous arrests in Chicago and New York were made by the police.

— During a severe thunderstorm the lightning struck many buildings in New York and the neighbourhood, including St. James's Cathedral, Brooklyn, which was set on fire, and the interior completely gutted.

12. A terrible accident occurred on the Great Northern Railway of Ireland, near Armagh. An excursion train, full of young children, whilst ascending the steep gradient to Killarney, parted in two, and the hinder part running back, with ever-increasing velocity, came in contact with the ordinary train leaving Armagh. In the collision which followed the carriages of the excursion train were smashed and thrown off the line, and between seventy and eighty children were killed on the spot, and as many were seriously injured.

— Mr. Gladstone visited Truro, St. Austell, and Bodmin, making long speeches at each place to the large crowds assembled to receive him.

13. The drivers belonging to the two largest cab companies in Paris struck for an advance of wages, and declined to resume work until a settlement was effected. By this cause more than one half of the Paris cabs were withdrawn.

— The Institute of Civil Engineers entertained at a grand banquet at Guildhall a large number of American Civil and Electrical Engineers, attending the meeting of the Congress. Sir John Coode presided, and the new American Minister, Mr. Robert Lincoln, made his first public speech in England.

14. The Samoan Conference, assembled at Berlin, arrived at an agreement under which autonomous government was guaranteed to the Samoan islands, under the joint control of Germany and the United States.

15. Festivities, lasting over several days, took place at Dresden in honour of the 800th anniversary of the founding of the Wettin dynasty by the Emperor Henry IV., who conferred the mark of Meissen upon Heinrich von Eilenburg or Wettin.

16. The Grand Prix de Paris won by M. H. Delamare's Vasistas (Rofe), a complete outsider. The only English representative was Mr. R. C. Vyner's Minthe, which finished fifth. Thirteen started.

— After an entry to St. Petersburg, marked by a gorgeous pageant, the marriage of the Grand Duke Paul and the Princess Alexandra of Greece celebrated at the Winter Palace with great pomp and ceremony.

17. The Prince of Wales, presiding over a meeting of the Committee for Promoting a Memorial to Father Damien, threw out the suggestion that it should take the form of a leper ward attached to one of the London hospitals.

— The Bishop of Limerick (Dr. O'Dwyer) placed the parish of Knock under an interdict in consequence of the attitude of the people in chapel towards one member of the congregation, described as a "land grabber."

18. The town of Ostrog, Volhynia, partially destroyed by fire, upwards of 1,000 people being rendered homeless, and damage done to the extent of several millions of roubles.

— Mr. Huntington, a wealthy American, subscribed \$500,000 towards the cost of the Congo Railway, as a mark of his admiration for the work of the King of the Belgians, and of his desire to render slavery unprofitable.

19. A terrible conflagration, lasting four days, destroyed more than half of the Chinese city of Loochow, in the province of Szechuen. Upwards of 1,200 lives were stated to have been lost, and 10,000 families rendered homeless.

20. Serious disturbances, arising out of recent strikes, took place at Kladno, in Bohemia. The residences of the Burgomaster and Mining-director were wrecked, and great rioting prevailed until the military arrived, when two of the rioters were shot, and many severely injured.

21. The principal events at the Ascot meeting decided as follows:—

Prince of Wales's Stakes.—Duke of Portland's Donovan (F. Barrett), 3 yrs., 9 st. 5 lbs. Eight started.

Ascot Stakes.—Sir R. Jardine's Lord Lorne (Chandler), 3 yrs., 6 st. 7 lbs. Twelve started.

Royal Hunt Cup.—Mr. D. Henty's Whitelegs (Blake), 4 yrs., 6 st. 6 lbs. Fifteen started.

Coronation Stakes.—Mr. Manton's Seclusion (T. Loates), 3 yrs., 8 st. 10 lbs. Nine started.

Gold Cup.—Mr. Warren de la Rue's Trayles (Robinson), 4 yrs., 9 st. Four started.

New Stakes.—Mr. A. W. Merry's Surefoot (Liddiard) (colt), 9 st. 3 lbs. Ten started.

Wokingham Stakes.—Mr. G. Cleveland's Bret Harte (Peake), 3 yrs., 6 st. 12 lbs. Fifteen started.

Alexandra Plate.—Mr. Warren de la Rue's Trayles (Robinson), 4 yrs., 9 st. 5 lbs. Four started.

Hardwicke Stakes.—Mr. Rose's Gulliver (Rickaby), 3 yrs., 8 st. 5 lbs. Six started.

— In the Court of Queen's Bench, Captain Woodward, R.N., of H.M.S. *Duke of Wellington*, fined 50*l.* and costs for contempt in not answering a writ of *habeas corpus*, issued by the Court in the case of a presumed desertion.

— Mr. Govin, *alias* Letine, a popular acrobat, stabbed at the Canterbury Theatre of Varieties, Westminster Bridge Road, by a man named Curragh, who, rushing across the road, drew a revolver and shot himself in the mouth. Letine died before reaching St. Thomas's Hospital, but Curragh's self-inflicted wound was not fatal. His daughter had once formed part of the Letine

troupe, and had died of consumption some six months previously. This loss had preyed upon the father's mind until it gave way.

22. Sir Henry B. Loch appointed Governor of the Cape Colony and its dependencies in the place of Sir Hercules Robinson, resigned.

— In connection with the 555th anniversary of the Battle of Bannockburn, Professor Blackie unfurled on the battle-field the English and Scottish standards, and expressed his hope for a real union of the two nations, rather than the merging of the less into the greater.

23. The Emperor of Austria, opening the Hungarian Delegation, reviewed the condition of affairs in Eastern Europe, blaming the King of Servia for having abdicated at so critical a moment.

24. The marriage of Prince Frederick Leopold of Prussia, only son of the "Red" Prince, and Princess Louise of Schleswig-Holstein, sister of the German Empress, celebrated with great pomp and splendour at Berlin. Neither the English Royal Family nor the Empress Frederick was specially represented at the ceremony.

— The French Government intimated its refusal to agree in the proposed conversion of the Egyptian Debt from 5 to 4 per cent. unless the English Government fixed the date for the evacuation of Egypt.

25. In the House of Commons Mr. Cuninghame Graham's motion for the adjournment of the House, which resolved itself into a question of limiting the hours of labour for adults, negatived by 189 to 124 votes.

— In the House of Lords the ministry narrowly escaped defeat on the third reading of the Land Transfer Bill, which involved the abolition of the rights of primogeniture. The Bill, ultimately carried by 113 to 104, was opposed by the Tory press.

26. The Portuguese Government gave notice of its determination to take over and complete the Delagoa Bay Railway, of which a concession had been made to an English company.

— A procession of the Salvation Army came into collision with the police in the Strand, in consequence of the refusal of the former to reach Exeter Hall by a circuitous route.

27. The Queen, who had returned from Scotland on the previous day, visited the Royal Agricultural Show in Windsor Great Park, and subsequently presented the Royal and Society medals to the winners.

— At Bucharest, and elsewhere within the kingdom of Servia, a great display made in honour of the five hundredth anniversary of the battle of Kossovo, the great fête of Serb independence, and the founding of the ancient Servian empire.

— The German Emperor and Empress arrived at Sigmaringen and attended the marriage of the Hereditary Prince of Hohenzollern with the Princess Maria Theresa of Bourbon.

28. The betrothal of the Princess Louise of Wales to the Earl of Fife, K.T., officially announced.

— The Portuguese Government, having taken forcible possession of the Delagoa Bay Railway, turned away all the company's officials. In London meetings were held to protest against the arbitrary conduct of the Portuguese authorities.

29. A terrific thunderstorm, lasting thirty-six hours, burst over Hong Kong, doing enormous damage to the streets, roads, and buildings, and fatally injuring many people. The rainfall alone was over thirty inches.

— After a hearing which extended over twelve days the arbitrators in the case of *Chetwynd v. Durham* made their award, giving Sir George Chetwynd one farthing damages (he having claimed 20,000*l.*), and ordering each party to pay its own costs.

— A man and young woman walking outside St. Thomas's Hospital were attacked by a man, who first stabbed the woman's companion in the neck and then the woman. The former died almost at once, after being removed to the hospital.

— According to Parliamentary returns the electors on the actual register were:—England and Wales, 4,653,736; Scotland, 574,072; Ireland, 754,545: Total, 5,982,353.

JULY.

1. Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., again arrested; on this occasion at Clonakilty, and in consequence of speeches made in connection with the evictions on the Ponsonby estates.

— The Shah of Persia arrived from Antwerp at Gravesend, where he was met by the Prince of Wales, and brought up the Thames to Westminster, whence he drove in State to Buckingham Palace.

— A meeting held at the Mansion House, presided over by the Lord Mayor, and attended by representative men of all classes, to express their sense of the services rendered by M. Pasteur's treatment of hydrophobia, and of the value of the Institute established to receive patients.

2. The Shah, after visiting the Queen at Windsor, attended a gala performance at the Royal Italian Opera.

— Alexander Karageorgovich, the youthful ruler of Servia, anointed king at the Monastery of Zitcha with great ceremonial.

— The inter-University cricket match brought to a rapid close by the defeat of Oxford in one innings. The following was the score:—

OXFORD.

| First Innings. | | Second Innings. | |
|---|-----|-------------------------|----|
| Mr. F. H. Gresson, c and b Woods | 0 | b Woods | 2 |
| Mr. H. W. Forster, c M'Gregor, b Woods | 14 | b Woods | 10 |
| Mr. W. Rashleigh, c Hale, b Ford | 9 | b Woods | 16 |
| Mr. A. K. Watson, c Thomas, b Ford | 0 | c and b Mordaunt | 18 |
| Lord George Scott, not out | 37 | c Hale, b Ford | 9 |
| Mr. M. R. Jardine, b Woods | 0 | b Mordaunt | 0 |
| Mr. A. C. M. Croome, b Woods | 1 | c M'Gregor, b De Little | 0 |
| Mr. H. Philipson (captain), b De Little | 13 | not out | 26 |
| Mr. M. J. Daughlish, b De Little | 0 | c M'Gregor, b Ford | 0 |
| Mr. H. Bassett, b Woods | 10 | c Mordaunt, b Woods | 0 |
| Mr. B. H. Moss, c M'Gregor, b Woods | 5 | b Woods | 0 |
| Byes, 15; w, 1 | 16 | Byes, 4; 1-b, 4; w, 1 | 9 |
| Total | 105 | Total | 90 |

CAMBRIDGE.

First Innings.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Mr. H. J. Mordaunt, c Philipson, b Bassett | . . . 127 |
| Mr. C. P. Foley, b Bassett | . . . 23 |
| Mr. F. Thomas, c Gresson, b Croome | . . . 18 |
| Mr. E. Crawley, b Jardine | . . . 54 |
| Mr. F. G. J. Ford (captain), l-b-w, b Moss | . . . 29 |
| Mr. R. C. Gosling, not out | . . . 22 |
| Mr. S. M. J. Woods, b Bassett | . . . 4 |
| Mr. E. M. Butler, c Forster b Bassett | . . . 0 |
| Mr. H. Hale, b Bassett | . . . 4 |
| Mr. G. McGregor, b Croome | . . . 0 |
| Mr. E. R. De Little, c and b Croome | . . . 4 |
| Byes, 13; leg-byes, 2; wide, 1 | . . . 16 |
| Total | . . . 300 |

3. Colonel Wodehouse, with a considerable force, came in contact with a dervish force advancing from Matuka, near Arguin on the Nile, south of Wady Halfa. Nearly 500 dervishes were killed or wounded, and as many taken prisoners.

— A terrible explosion of fire-damp took place at the Verpilloux pit, near St. Étienne.

— The Shah visits the City and was received at the Guildhall by the Lord Mayor in great state.

— The Court of Inquiry into the abandonment of H.M.S. *Sultan* after stranding reported that no one was blamable for not getting her off the rock upon which she had struck.

4. The three days' sale of the Secretan collection of pictures and decorative objects at Paris realised a total of upwards of 240,000*l*.

— The Belgian steamship *Princesse Henriette*, during the passage between Ostend and Dover, burst one of her cylinders, and after considerable delay was towed back to Ostend.

— The town of Ellensburg, Washington Territory, consisting of about 6,000 inhabitants, almost wholly destroyed by a fire caused by the fireworks let off in honour of "Independence Day."

— In the House of Commons Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment to refer the whole Civil List to the Committee on Royal Grants negatived by 313 to 125 votes.

5. The final heats at Henley Regatta were thus decided:—

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Diamond Sculls. Mr. Guy Nickalls, Oxford University Boat Club | . . . 100 yards. |
| Grand Challenge Cup. Eights. Thames Rowing Club | . . . 1 length. |
| Visitors' Challenge Cup. Fours. Third Trinity Boat Club | . . . 2½ lengths. |
| Ladies' Challenge Plate. Eights. Christ Church Boat Club | . . . 1½ lengths. |
| Wyfold Challenge Cup. Fours. London Rowing Club | . . . 4 lengths. |
| Silver Goblets. Pair-oars. Messrs. J. C. Gardner and G. D. Muttelbury, Cambridge University Boat Club | . . . 3 feet. |
| Thames Challenge Cup. Eights. Christ Church Boat Club, Oxford | . . . 4 lengths. |
| Stewards' Challenge Cup. Fours. Thames Rowing Club | . . . 5 lengths. |

— In the House of Lords the debate on the Land Transfer Bill resumed, and the clause placing real and personal property on a similar footing having been rejected by 122 to 113, Lord Salisbury announced that the Bill would be withdrawn.

5. The election for West Fife resulted in the election of Mr. Augustine Birrell (G.L.) by 3,551 votes over Mr. Wemyss (L.U.), who polled 2,758 votes.

6. A serious timber fire broke out in the Russia Dock of the Surrey Commercial Docks, and was not extinguished for several hours. Almost simultaneously a fire was also raging at the Stratford Saw Mills, on the north side of the Thames, which did considerable damage; and a few hours later a vast block of buildings in Great Dover Street, Southwark, were almost completely destroyed.

— At a special meeting of the Jockey Club a letter was read from Sir G. Chetwynd, resigning his membership, which was accepted without discussion.

8. The matches for the Lawn Tennis (single-handed) Championship ended in the recovery of the Challenge Cup by Mr. W. Renshaw, who beat the holder, his brother, Mr. E. Renshaw, by three sets to one. Mr. W. Renshaw previously won his match with Mr. Barlow by three sets to two—the latter having defeated Mr. W. T. Hamilton, who had defeated Mr. W. Renshaw in 1888.

— The Marquess of Salisbury entertained the Shah at Hatfield House, and gave a grand garden party in his honour.

— The prize fight between Sullivan and Kilrain for \$20,000 and the championship of the world took place at Richburg, about 100 miles from New Orleans. The fight lasted for more than two and a quarter hours, and Sullivan won after 72 rounds.

9. A serious railway accident took place on the line between Munich and Frankfort, near Röhrmoos, in which several persons were killed and forty injured.

10. The French Army Bill, substituting three years' service without exemption for the previous system of five years' service, passed the Chamber of Deputies. The service of seminarists with the colours for one year was made obligatory.

— Snowden, the highest of the Welsh mountains, containing about 1,500 acres, with fishing, mineral and other rights, sold by public auction for 5,750*l.* to Sir E. W. Watkin, M.P.

— Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., announced, in a speech at Clonmel, that Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party proposed to establish a Tenants' Defence League in opposition to the Landlords' Association, and to supersede the Land League and the Plan of Campaign.

11. In the French Chamber the Boulangist deputy, M. Laguerre, brought business to a standstill by refusing to leave the tribune, from which he attacked the Ministerial policy. The President was consequently forced to close the sitting, leaving M. Laguerre in possession of the tribune.

— Archdeacon Randall appointed Suffragan Bishop of Reading, and Rev. Canon Ware Suffragan Bishop of Derby.

12. A statue of Camille Desmoulins unveiled in the Palais Royal, and erected on the spot where, on the same day in 1789, he had made his famous appeal to the Parisians.

13. In the final match for the Four-handed Lawn Tennis Championship Messrs. W. and E. Renshaw beat Messrs. E. W. Lewis and G. W. Hillyard by three sets to two, the score being: 6—4, 6—4, 3—6, 0—6, 6—1.

18 The Eton and Harrow cricket match resulted in the victory of the latter by nine wickets. Score:—

HARROW.

| First Innings. | | Second Innings. | |
|---|-----|-------------------|----|
| Mr. A. C. M'Laren, b Studd | 17 | b Studd | 16 |
| Mr. C. G. Pope, c Gosling, b J. Ward | 1 | | |
| Mr. C. P. Wills, c and b Davenport | 50 | not out | 28 |
| Mr. R. B. Hoare, b Studd | 85 | not out | 5 |
| Mr. F. S. Jackson (captain), c Studd, b Davenport | 68 | | |
| Mr. D. E. Napier, c Studd, b J. Ward | 38 | | |
| Mr. A. Neame, b Davenport | 2 | | |
| Mr. W. B. Anderson, b J. Ward | 10 | | |
| Mr. R. S. Chaplin, b Studd | 21 | | |
| Mr. H. M. Peebles, b Tollemache | 7 | | |
| Mr. J. Gowans, not out | 13 | | |
| Byes, 5; 1-b, 5 | 10 | Leg-bye | 1 |
| Total | 272 | Total | 50 |

ETON.

| First Innings. | | Second Innings. | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| Mr. W. G. Crum, run out | 33 | b Jackson | 5 |
| Mr. G. B. Gosling, c Gowans, b Anderson | 6 | c Napier, b Wills | 35 |
| Mr. J. E. Talbot, c Wills, b Anderson | 7 | c Gowans, b Jackson | 0 |
| Hon. M. G. Tollemache, c Gowans, b Hoare | 27 | c M'Laren, b Pope | 29 |
| Mr. H. W. Studd, c Gowans, b Jackson | 9 | c M'Laren, b Pope | 0 |
| Mr. H. B. Bromley-Davenport (captain) b Pope | 31 | c and b Hoare | 42 |
| Mr. M. H. Tristram, not out | 26 | c Gowans, b Hoare | 2 |
| Mr. H. F. Wright, c Jackson, b Peebles | 8 | c Wills, b Anderson | 9 |
| Mr. R. T. Jones, b Jackson | 8 | not out | 12 |
| Hon. R. A. Ward, b Jackson | 0 | c Gowans, b Anderson | 6 |
| Hon. J. H. Ward, b Anderson | 0 | b Anderson | 0 |
| Byes, 6; 1-b, 6; w, 2 | 14 | Byes, 8; 1-b, 2; w, 1; n-b, 1 | 12 |
| Total | 169 | Total | 152 |

— In the French Chamber of Deputies, M. Le Hérisse, for having declared during the debate on the Plurality of Candidatures Bill that some of the Ministers ought to be at the bar of the police court, was called upon to retract, and having refused was ordered to be expelled. He declined, however, to leave the tribune, and the sitting was temporarily suspended. A file of soldiers having entered the Chamber without arms, M. Le Hérisse at once complied with their summons to come down, and left the Chamber.

14. The celebration of the Fête of the Republic passed off with only a slight display of hostility to the Government. A meeting of Boulangists in the Place de la Concorde was dispersed after a short struggle with the police.

15. The Scottish National Portrait Gallery, erected at a cost of 50,000*l.*, wholly defrayed by Mr. T. Ritchie Findlay, the principal proprietor of the *Scotsman* newspaper, opened by the Marquess of Lothian, Secretary of State for Scotland.

— Discovery made by General Grant Wilson in the public archives of the Hague of a letter addressed to the States-General of the United Netherlands by P. Schagen, announcing the purchase of the island of Manhattan (now New York) by the Dutch West India Company for \$24.

— The Emperor of Brazil when leaving the theatre at Rio fired at by a Portuguese, but without any effect.

16. At the assembling of the Parnell Commission, Sir Charles Russell and his colleagues announced that Mr. Parnell and the other Irish members had instructed their various counsel to withdraw from the further proceedings.

— The Chief Commissioner of Police in his annual report referred to a general increase of crime in the metropolis, where twenty-eight discovered murders had been committed, and in only two cases had the perpetrators been arrested.

17. Another murder—the eighth—of a woman committed in Whitechapel, accompanied by an attempt at mutilation, as in the previous cases.

— At the auction mart an "Adventurer's" share in the New River Company—the first ever offered in public—sold for 122,800*l.*, or about 47 years' purchase of the actual rate of income.

— The new buildings of the Royal Naval School at Chislehurst transferred from the original site at New Cross opened by Prince George of Wales, Lieutenant, R.N.

— The Portland Stakes, value 6,000 guineas, won by Mr. H. Milner's colt Riviera (T. Loates), defeating the favourite, Semolina, and five others.

— Mr. J. Lloyd Morgan (G.L.) returned for West Carmarthenshire by 4,252 votes against Mr. Williams Drummond (C.), who polled 2,588 votes.

18. Orders having been issued by the Admiralty to mobilise the fleet, ninety-four vessels of war at twenty-eight hours' notice received their full complement of men, their non-combustible stores, and made ready to leave their respective harbours.

— The charges against General Boulanger, Messrs. Dillon and Rochefort published, referring chiefly to matters of financial irregularity not discovered previously.

19. The contest in East Marylebone, consequent on the resignation of Lord Charles Beresford (C), resulted in the return of Mr. E. Boulnois (C.), by 2,579 over Mr. G. Leveson-Gower (G.L.), who polled 2,086 votes.

— At Sandown Park, the Eclipse Stakes (third year), value 10,000*l.*, won easily by the Duke of Portland's Ayrshire, 4 yrs., 10 st. 2 lb. (F. Barrett). Six started.

— Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., appeared as plaintiff in a trial for a libel against the Marquess of Salisbury, for statements made in a public speech. After two days' trial the jury returned a verdict for the defendant.

20. The freedom of the city of Edinburgh presented to Mr. C. S. Parnell, M.P., who subsequently attended a large meeting at the Corn Exchange, presided over by the Earl of Aberdeen.

— The Shah of Persia, accompanied by Prince Albert Victor of Wales, after visiting the principal centres of commerce and manufacture in England and Scotland, arrived at Invercauld House, Braemar, as the guest of Sir Algernon Borthwick, M.P.

— In consequence of the delay in making the ranges at Bisley Common the meeting of the National Rifle Association was once more held at Wimbledon. The following were the results of the principal contests, in many of which the shooting was most remarkable:—

MATCHES.

| Matches | Yards | Highest possible Score | Total Scores |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Auxiliary Officers (any rifle) | 800, 900, 1,000 | 1,800 | Auxiliary Officers 1,617 Regular " 1,572 |
| Humphrey Challenge Cup (any rifle) | Do. | 900 | Oxford University 707 Cambridge " 686 |
| Eleho Shield (any rifle) | Do. | 1,800 | Ireland 1,689 England 1,682 Scotland 1,626 |
| Vizianagram Cup (Martini-Hy.) | 500 | 900 | Did not hit. |
| National Challenge Trophy (Martini-Henry) | 200, 500, 600 | 2,100 | England 1,748 Scotland 1,709 Volunteers 718 Regulars 677 |
| United Services (Martini-Henry) | Do. | 840 | Canada 687 Mother Country 684 |
| Kolapore Cup (Martini-Henry) | Do. | 840 | Cambridge 615 Oxford 562 |
| Chancellor's Plate (Martini-Hy.) | Do | 840 | Charterhouse 469 Winchester 446 Lancashire 431 |
| Ashburton Shield (Martini-Hy) | 200, 800 | 560 | 1st V.B. North Lancashire 54 |
| China Cup (Martini-Henry) | 500 | 500 | 12th Middlesex (1st team) 178 |
| Mullen's (Martini-Henry) | Disappearing target | — | Ayrshire Yeomanry 128 |
| Mappin's Cup (Martini-Henry) | 400, 500 (run) | — | |
| Lloyd Lindsay (canbure) | 300, 600 (riding) | — | |

PRIZES.

| Prize | Yards | Highest possible Score | Scores |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Albert Jewel (any rifle) | 1,000 | 75 | Lieut Orley, 2nd V.B. Sussex 71 |
| Alexandra (Martini-Hy.) | 500, 600 | 70 | Sergt. McPhail, 5th V.B. Highland Light Infantry 68 |
| Alfred (Martini-Henry) | 500 | 35 | Priv Masson, 2nd V.B. Royal Bords 88 |
| Daily Telegraph Cup (Martini-Henry) | 200 | 35 | Gunner Ferguson, A. G. and A. 85 |
| Martin Cup (Martini-Hy.) | 600 | 35 | Sergt. MacInnann, 1st Inverness 35 |
| Windmill (Martini-Henry) | 200, 500 | 70 | Qr-Mstr-Sergt Ogg, Canada 68 |
| St. George's Vase (Martini-Henry) | 500 | 35 | Sergt Lowson, 1st Lanark 35 |
| Queen's Prize (Martini-Henry)—1st stage | 200, 500, 600 | 105 | Bronze Medal, Priv. Rippon, 2nd V.B. Essex 99 |
| " 2nd stage | { 1st stage 500, 600 } | 230 | Silver Medal, Priv. Wattleworth, 2nd V.B. Liverpool 205 |
| " 3rd stage | { 1st and 2nd stages 800, 900 } | 380 | Sergt. Reid, 1st Lanark Engineers 261 |
| Prince of Wales's Prize (Martini-Henry) | 200, 600 | 110 | Priv Hayhurst, 1st V.B. Royal Lancashire 99 |
| Olympic (Martini-Henry) | 600 | 50 | May Pearce, 4th Devon 48 |
| All Comers' Aggregate | — | — | Sergt Cusey, 1st Hereford 188 |
| Volunteers | — | — | Capt Morrison, 1st Sutherland 157 |
| Grand | — | — | Capt Morrison, 1st Sutherland 338 |
| Nursery | — | — | Priv Radley, 1st North Lancashire 95 |

21. A meeting called in Hyde Park to protest against the extension of grants to the Royal Family. In consequence, perhaps, of the wet weather, the numbers attending were very limited, but various resolutions were passed.

22. The Spanish Government conveyed to the municipal corporations of Seville and other cities its orders to take no part in demonstrations to encourage Pope Leo XIII. to come to Spain.

— A serious rising took place in various parts of Crete, the Turkish authorities being expelled from Varnos and Gidonia, and the public archives destroyed.

22. The Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into the question of Royal Grants reported generally in favour of an addition of 36,000*l.* to the income of the Prince of Wales for the maintenance and provision of his younger children. Her Majesty conveyed to the Committee notice that it was her intention to provide for her other grandchildren.

24. The Liverpool Cup won by Mr. W. J. Legh's Veracity, 5 yrs., 8 st. (Calder). Fourteen started.

— The Prince of Wales, accompanied by the Princess of Wales, laid the memorial stone of the new buildings of the Samaritan Free Hospital, Marylebone Road.

— Bribery on a very large scale detected among the German dockyard officials at Kiel and elsewhere. A number of officers, including one in high command, were placed under arrest, one of the accused committing suicide on the spot.

— The ex-King Milan of Servia returned to Belgrade and was received with great ceremony by his son and the ministers and the Court, and with much cordiality by the people.

25. The evidence called by the *Times* on the one part and Mr. Parnell and his colleagues on the other closed, and the Special Commission, having sat for 112 days, adjourned over the Long Vacation.

— Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone's golden wedding day celebrated by the presentation of his portrait by Sir John Millais, "the gift of English, Scotch, and Irish women," and by numerous congratulations from the Queen, the Prince and Princess of Wales and other members of the Royal Family, and personal friends and admirers.

26. In the House of Commons, after two nights' debate, Mr. Labouchere's amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the Royal Grants defeated by 400 to 118. Mr. Gladstone and 40 Liberals, including Sir Wm. Harcourt, Mr. J. Morley, and Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Parnell and 50 Irish Home Rulers, supported the Government. The minority included one Irish Nationalist (Mr. T. P. O'Connor).

— News reached this country that the Yellow River had burst its banks at Shantung, about fifty miles from its mouth; and, sweeping away above half a mile of embankment, had inundated an enormous tract of country to a depth of 12 feet. The loss of life was estimated at thousands, and the destruction of property was incalculable.

27. The marriage of the Earl of Fife and Princess Louise of Wales celebrated in the private chapel of Buckingham Palace in the presence of the Queen, the Royal Family, and about 200 invited guests.

— The Queen conferred upon the Earl of Fife the dignities of Duke of Fife and Marquess of Macduff, he having declined the title of Duke of Inverness.

— Southern Hungary visited by a destructive storm. At Szegedin and other places many houses were destroyed, several mills blown down, and many lives lost.

— The New Zealand House of Representatives adjourned over Sunday after a continuous sitting of seventy-six hours, entirely devoted to the discussion of the Representation Bill introduced by the Government.

28. The elections for the Councils General throughout France resulted in a slight Republican loss, but General Boulanger, although a candidate in 88 cantons, was only elected in twelve.

— A man named Handford, a victim to intemperance, shot his wife and mother-in-law in broad daylight as they were coming out of Brondesbury Chapel, Kilburn, and then attempted to commit suicide by shooting himself.

29. The Shah, having visited a number of towns in England, left Brighton for Portsmouth, where after passing through the fleet assembled at Spithead, by which he was received with a grand salute, he proceeded to Osborne to take leave of the Queen.

— In the House of Commons, Mr. J. Morley's amendment to the Royal Grants resolution, following the lines of Mr. Labouchere's previous amendment, negatived by 357 to 136. Mr. Gladstone and seventeen Liberals; Mr. Parnell and forty-two Nationalists supported the Government. Mr. Childers, Sir Wm. Harcourt, Mr. Whitbread and several members of the front Opposition Bench voted with Mr. Morley.

— Lord Randolph Churchill opened at Walsall a campaign in the Midlands, and explained the programme of the Conservative Democrats.

30. An earthquake partially destroyed the town of Kumamoto on the island of Kiou Siou, near Nagasaki, causing serious loss of life and great destruction of property. A few hours later a shock was also felt at San Francisco.

— Considerable excitement aroused in Canada by the seizure in Behring Straits of the sealing schooner *Black Diamond* by the United States' revenue cutter *Rush*. The captain of the former, however, instead of steering for Sitka, as directed, carried the prize officer on board to Victoria, British Columbia.

— A revolution broke out in Hawani, during which the palace-grounds and the Government House were temporarily seized by the insurgents. The militia eventually suppressed the rising with small loss.

31. In consequence of the disturbances in Crete and the Balkans, the Turkish Government issued orders to call out 80,000 men of the Reserves.

— Millet's *Angelus*, which at the Secretan sale had been knocked down to the representative of the French Government, finally passed into the hands of the American Art Association for 23,226*l.*, the French Chamber having failed to vote the necessary credit. The price originally paid to Millet, the painter, for the work was 1,800 francs (72*l.*)

AUGUST.

1. The German Emperor arrived in the Downs on board the imperial yacht *Hohenzollern*, accompanied by a fleet of twelve German war-ships.

— The "zone" system adopted on all Hungarian railways—the same rate of fare being charged between all places within the same "zone," the three classes of carriages being still maintained. Compared with the old fares, the new system showed an average reduction of 25 per cent.

2. The principal events at the Goodwood meeting were thus decided:—

The Stewards' Cup.—Mr. Arthur James's Dog Rose, 6 yrs., 7 st. 12 lbs. (J. Woodburn). Eighteen started.

The March Stakes.—Duke of Portland's Elsie, 2 yrs., 7 st. 4 lbs. (T. Loates). Nine started.

The Sussex Stakes.—Mr. D. Baird's Enthusiast, 2 yrs., 9 st. 3 lbs. (Warne). Four started.

The Chesterfield Cup.—Mr. W. J. Legh's Veracity, 5 yrs., 9 st. 3 lbs. (Calder). Ten started.

The Prince of Wales' Stakes.—Duke of Portland's Semolina, 2 yrs., 8 st. 8 lbs. (F. Barrett). Six started.

The Rous Memorial Stakes.—Mr. H. Milner's Riviera, 2 yrs., 9 st. 3 lbs. (T. Loates). Seven started.

The Goodwood Cup.—Mr. Warren Dela Rue's Trayles, 4 yrs., 9 st. (Robinson). Two started.

The Chichester Stakes.—Mr. Arthur James's Dog Rose, 6 yrs., 9 st. 4 lbs. (Watts). Nine started.

The Goodwood Stakes.—Mr. A. Tayler's Ingram, 4 yrs., 7 st. 1 lb. (Loates). Six started.

2. A Royal decree, issued without warning or explanation, closed the session of the Italian Parliament.

— The remains of Carnot, "the organiser of victory," removed from Magdeburg—where he had died in exile—prior to his re-interment in the Panthéon at Paris.

3. The Naval Review at Spithead, held in honour of the visit of the German Emperor, postponed on account of the violent gale which rendered the inspection impossible. The fleet assembled was composed of 20 armour-clads, 35 cruisers, 18 gun-vessels, and 38 torpedo boats, having a total displacement of 243,522 tons, and carrying 596 guns, and 20,000 blue-jackets.

— General Grenfell commanding the British and Egyptian troops on the Nile attacked the dervish troops under Wad-el-Njumi, and after seven hours' hard fighting drove him back into the desert, killing him, his principal Emin, and 500 fighting men, and taking upwards of 1,000 prisoners.

— The railway-bridge spanning the Dee at Queensferry opened by Mrs. Gladstone, to whom and to Mr. Gladstone an address and casket on the occasion of their golden wedding were presented.

5. The Naval Review in honour of the German Emperor passed off with great success and in presence of a large number of spectators.

— The *fête des Vignerons*, a ceremony dating from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, opened at Vevey, where upwards of 10,000 persons were assembled. The procession, &c., comprised upwards of 1,500 characters.

6. The fleet assembled at Spithead, divided into four squadrons, weighed anchor, and proceeded in various directions in anticipation of the naval manœuvres of the season.

— The Poet Laureate (Lord Tennyson), on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, received numerous public congratulations and addresses.

7. Mrs. Florence Maybrick, after a trial lasting over seven days, found guilty of poisoning her husband with arsenic. The verdict was received with strong marks of disapproval outside the court. The death sentence pronounced was, after considerable delay, commuted into one of penal servitude for life.

— The German Emperor and Prince Henry of Prussia visited Aldershot, where a review of about 27,000 men of all arms, volunteers included, was held in his honour.

8. The Bank of England raised its rate of discount from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent., 631,000*l.* in gold having been withdrawn from the Bank during the week, although only 94,000*l.* had been exported. The reserve stood at 20,151,000*l.*, or 36·18 per cent. of the liabilities.

— The bishopric of Sydney, the Metropolitan See of Australia, conferred on Canon W. Saumarez Smith, D.D., Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead.

9. Previous to the departure of the German Emperor from Osborne, the Queen reviewed the seamen and marines of the German fleet lying in Osborne Bay. Shortly before sunset, the Emperor took farewell of the Queen and embarked on his return to Germany.

— M. Gagneur, deputy for the Jura, an ardent advocate of cremation, died in Paris, and was first to be incinerated in the crematory of Père-la-Chaise.

10. The Emperor of Austria opened the new Vienna Natural History Museum, the largest building of the kind on the continent, the various collections made by successive Emperors since Francis I., who purchased the Baillou collection in 1748, having been at length brought together.

— The Shah, after a cordial reception combined with many magnificent entertainments, left Paris for Baden-Baden.

— The town of Sachsenburg, in the principality of Waldeck, containing about 1,000 inhabitants, almost wholly destroyed by fire, which raged unchecked for two days.

12. The Emperor Francis Joseph arrived in Berlin on a visit to the Emperor William, and was received with great enthusiasm by the populace. A series of military fêtes were given during his visit which lasted over three days, and the firmness of the Triple Alliance insisted upon at the banquets which ensued.

— In the House of Commons, the Government narrowly escaped defeat in several divisions in going into Committee on the Tithes Bill. On one their majority was only four.

— The Queen gazetted, in the German *Reichsanzeiger*, honorary Colonel of the 1st Regiment of Horse Guards, to be in future known as "The Queen of England's Own."

13. The French Senate, sitting as a High Court of Justice, by 206 votes, six others abstaining, found General Boulanger guilty of conspiracy against the State, and Count Dillon and M. de Rochefort of the same offence.

— Chakir Pasha, the newly appointed Governor of Crete, arrived at the island and informed a deputation of Cretans and Turks of the Sultan's determination to restore order, but promised to inquire into legitimate grievances. A state of siege proclaimed throughout the island.

— The first Mahommedan mosque erected in England completed at Woking.

14. General Boulanger and his associates having been further found guilty of misappropriation of public money, &c., sentence was pronounced upon them by the High Court, and General Boulanger, Count Dillon, and M. H. de Rochefort were severally condemned to transportation for life, with confinement in a fortified place. The news created no sensation in Paris, or elsewhere.

14. At Lathorp, California, on the arrival of the morning train, Mr. D. Terry, formerly a district judge, entered the railway restaurant, and, seeing Judge Stephen Field of the United States Supreme Court, went up to him and slapped him on the face. Marshal Nagle, in attendance on Judge Stephen, at once drew his revolver, fired twice, and Mr. Terry fell dead, shot through the heart. Mr. Nagle was placed under arrest, but was speedily released.

15. In the Grand Committee of the House of Commons on Trade, a discussion on procedure in connection with the Light Railways (Ireland) Bill having arisen, a number of the members of the minority—opposed to the Bill—withdraw after a protest, and the Bill subsequently passed through the Committee and was reported to the House.

— The London County Council having declined to take any notice of the order of the Privy Council with regard to the muzzling of dogs, on the ground that it had no control over the Metropolitan Police, the Privy Council at last directed the Police Commissioner to see to the carrying out of the order.

16. In the House of Commons, the Government having substituted the liability of the owner for that of the occupier of tithe-lands and made other important changes, Mr. W. H. Smith, in deference to the ruling of the Speaker, withdrew his proposed Bill.

— Several slight but spirited engagements took place between the Turkish troops and Cretan insurgents in the districts round the plain of Canea and Retinio. Murders and plunderings reported from both sides, and several Mussulman and Christian villages set on fire.

— The German Emperor and Empress left Berlin for Bayreuth to attend a Wagner performance, *en route* for Carlsruhe, Strasburg and Metz.

17. A serious colliery explosion took place in one of the pits of the Chall Colliery Company, North Staffordshire, by which an exploring party of three men were killed.

18. A grand banquet, given in the Palais de l'Industrie by the Municipal Council of Paris to 13,000 provincial *maires*, at which President Carnot presided and welcomed the guests. Two days were occupied in cooking the dinner, which was served cold, with the exception of soup and coffee, but the arrangements were so good that everyone was served satisfactorily.

— At Rome, during a public concert in the Piazza Colonna, a bomb was thrown into the crowd, seriously wounding two policemen and six others.

19. A serious accident occurred on the North-Eastern Railway, near Ryhope station. The train in descending a steep gradient left the lines. One child was killed and a number of passengers seriously injured.

— Sir Arthur Havelock appointed Governor of Ceylon, Sir Charles Mitchell Governor of Natal, and Sir Wm. Robinson Governor of Western Australia.

— A strike of labourers employed at the docks in and near London for increased and more certain rates of payment commenced. About 12,000 men came out on the first day, and were rapidly joined by others, including lightermen, stevedores, coal porters, &c., until upwards of 75,000 men joined the movement, and the whole shipping trade of London was completely paralysed.

20. After a long continuance of cold and unseasonable weather, heavy

rains, floods and gales reported from all parts of the United Kingdom, causing great damage to crops and shipping.

20. The German Emperor and Empress arrived at Strasburg to open the new palace erected at the cost of two and a half million marks. They were received with great ceremony and apparent cordiality by the inhabitants.

— During a hailstorm which burst over the village of Pohrlitz, near Grusbad in Moravia, many of the hailstones were bigger than a man's fist, and weighed three pounds; the smallest were as large as hens' eggs. The storm lasted seventeen minutes, in which time three men, two women and three children were killed, many were seriously injured, and property valued at 100,000*l.* destroyed.

21. The Treasury Minute (dated Aug. 10) reorganising the Civil Service issued, based upon the second Report of the Royal Commission on Civil Establishments.

— The civil war in Hayti, which had continued for more than twelve months, ended by the surrender of General Légitime, and the occupation of Port-au-Prince by General Hippolyte.

— After long continuance of heavy rains, the province of Kii, in the south-west part of Japan, was devastated by the most terrible floods, caused by the overflowing of the Kinogawe river and adjacent streams. Nearly 15,000 people were supposed to have lost their lives; several towns were completely swept away, and many others nearly destroyed.

22. The Home Secretary, after a lengthy investigation, recommended the Queen to commute the sentence of death passed on Mrs. Maybrick into one of penal servitude for life.

— The first train over the Knoxville Cumberland Gap, on the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, ran off the lines. Of the fifty-six passengers in the train three were killed, and forty-one injured, several fatally.

23. The Queen, accompanied by the Princess Beatrice, arrived at Palé Hall, near Lake Bala, which had been placed at her disposal by Mr. Robertson, during her Majesty's visit to North Wales.

— The London *Gazette* notified the conditions under which telegraph money orders would be issued and paid at certain offices.

— The accounts from Armenia showed that in many parts of the province anarchy prevailed, and outrages by the Kurdish tribes upon Christians greatly on the increase. Moussa Bey, the Kurd leader, sent to Constantinople for trial.

24. After visiting Metz, where he was well received, and laying the first stone of a monument to the Emperor William, the German Emperor returned by way of Munster to Berlin. By order of the Emperor, the Governor-General of Alsace-Lorraine expressed the thanks of their Majesties for their brilliant reception in Reichsland.

25. An enormous procession, estimated at over fifty thousand, marched from the Docks to Hyde Park, where resolutions supporting their cause were passed. Everything went off in perfect order.

26. Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., again condemned to prison for two months, and to give securities for good behaviour for a further period, for inciting

tenants on the Ponsonby estates not to pay their rents. Mr. Gilhooly, M.P., was at the same time sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment.

26. H.M.S. *Sultan*, which had sunk on a reef near Malta and had been abandoned, raised by an Italian company, and safely brought into harbour. The salvage paid to the company was 50,000*l*.

27. The Queen, after visiting Wrexham, Ruabon, Llangollen and many other neighbouring places, left North Wales for Scotland.

28. E. J. Reddish, of Brighton, swam the distance from Blackwall Pier to the Town Pier at Gravesend (19 miles 4 furlongs) in 5 hrs. 11 min. 50 secs., or two furlongs further than Captain Webb, though less rapidly.

— Messrs. W. H. Grenfell, of Taplow Court, R. C. Lehman, and W. F. Holland rowed from Oxford to Putney (105 miles) in a treble sculling boat in 20½ hours; their average pace was nine miles to the hour, and they rowed 30 strokes per second.

29. The naval manœuvres, which included a brilliant engagement between two squadrons off Ushant, closed, having afforded further evidence of the difficulty of protecting defenceless seaports and towns by the home fleet. The "enemy's" fleet, in spite of being inferior in numbers, escaped from the blockade, and "ravaged" the coasts of the three kingdoms with little hindrance.

— The Bank of England raised the bank rate of exchange to 4 per cent., the reserve showing 20,201,165*l*., or 40¼ per cent. of the liabilities.

— The body of Colonel George Tomline, of Carlton House Terrace and Orwell Park, Suffolk, cremated at Woking, after a funeral service held at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields.

30. The fourth session of the twelfth Parliament of the present reign pro-rogued by Royal Commission.

— The convent of the Alexians at Louvain, to which a lunatic asylum was attached, completely destroyed by fire. The patients, 200 in number, were saved, but many of the attendants were seriously injured.

— The Marquess of Londonderry, having resigned the post of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, left Dublin after receiving deputations and farewell addresses from various societies and public bodies.

31. The relative position of the counties at the close of the cricket season showed Nottinghamshire, Lancashire, and Surrey "tying" for the first place, followed by Kent, Middlesex, Gloucestershire, Yorkshire, and Sussex.

— The remains of General Pasquale de Paoli, the Corsican patriot, who died in London on Feb. 5, 1807, removed from the St. Pancras churchyard to be re-interred in his native village.

— The Sultan of Zanzibar ceded the port and island of Lamer, the third most important *entrepôt* on the Zanzibar coast, and four other ports to the northward to the British East Africa Company.

SEPTEMBER.

1. A serious fire at the Northern Railway station, Madrid, destroyed the large goods shed containing vast quantities of valuable goods, besides nine railway waggons.

2. A general strike made by the Jewish workmen in the East-end and Central districts of London, and chiefly directed against the sweating system. Upwards of 10,000 men, chiefly tailors, cabinet-makers, and cigar-makers, joined the strike. They demanded a twelve hours working day, better wages, and improved sanitation of workshops.

— The turret 88-ton gun of H.M.S. *Ajax*, guardship of the Clyde, burst during practice, the shell having exploded in the gun.

— A litigation concerning forty acres of barren land which had commenced in 1490 brought to a conclusion in the Warsaw Courts by an amicable arbitration.

3. The literary partnership between MM. Erekmann and Chatrian ended by a serious quarrel—the latter accusing his former friend of being at heart a German.

— The Trades Union Congress, under the presidency of Mr. Ritchie, assembled at Dundee. The president in his address advocated the eight-hours rule for labour and the intervention of Parliament to secure it; but this opinion was not adopted by the Congress. Out of 885,000 members of trades unions, only thirty-three societies, numbering 169,000 members, made a return of their views; of these only 102,000 voted—viz. 39,629 in favour of the eight-hours day, and 62,383 against it.

4. On returning homewards through Southern Russia the Shah's train fell over a high embankment on the line between Winnica and Zmerinka. The carriages were thrown down in such a way that for some time it was impossible to extricate the Shah from his saloon carriage; but he was eventually found to have suffered no injury.

5. Mr. H. Chaplin, M.P., appointed first Minister of Agriculture, with a seat in the Cabinet.

— A fire broke out at Mauricewood pit at Penicuik, Midlothian, by which seventy miners lost their lives.

— The removal of the obstruction on the Lower Danube known as "The Iron Gate" commenced by the blowing up of the huge rock in the middle of the river.

6. A frightful explosion took place at a cartridge factory in Antwerp, where fifty million cartridges were stored close to huge depôts of petroleum containing 60,000 gallons of oil. Ninety-five people were killed on the spot, one-half of whom could not be identified, and 100 others were more or less seriously wounded. The explosion did enormous damage throughout the city, where nearly all the windows broke, and set fire to the petroleum, which burnt furiously for several hours over more than two acres of ground. At one time the shipping in the port was in serious danger, but the wind happily shifted, and few vessels were damaged.

7. Mr. Gladstone, who with Mrs. Gladstone had been spending a week in Paris, entertained at a dinner given by a number of distinguished French statesmen and economists, to whose welcome—by M. Léon Say—he replied in a French speech, and expressed his sense of the value of French influence and friendship.

— Three batteries of the 2nd Dorset Volunteer Artillery refused to attend the official inspection in consequence of a dispute arising out of a shooting competition.

— A man named Steve Brodie, who had previously jumped off Brooklyn bridge, went over the Niagara Falls in an india-rubber suit surrounded with steel bands and thickly padded. He was brought ashore on the Canadian side insensible and much bruised, but ultimately recovered.

9. In the twenty-four hours' road race, promoted by the North Road Cyclists' Club, Mr. M. A. Holbein rode 175 miles in twelve hours, and 323 in twenty-four hours. His time for 100 miles was 6 hrs. 33 min. 30 sec.

— The International Sculling Championship and 500L. decided on the Thames course in favour of Henry E. Searle, the Australian representative, born at Grafton, New South Wales, 1866, who defeated the only competitor, Wm. O'Connor, of Toronto, born 1863, by about six lengths, having led the whole way.

10. The body—fearfully mangled—of a woman found under one of the arches of the Great Eastern Railway in Pinchin Street, Whitechapel, in close proximity to the spots where eight other murders had been committed within little more than a year. In this case the body, which had been hacked to pieces, and of which the head was missing, had been brought to the spot some days subsequent to the murder.

— The Great Yorkshire Handicap at Doncaster won by Mr. J. Lowther's Houndsditch (Blake), 3 yrs., 6 st. 11 lb. Eleven started. An objection for "boring" was overruled.

11. The St. Leger Stakes at Doncaster won by the favourite, the Duke of Portland's Donovan (F. Barrett). Twelve started.

— A great storm broke upon the north Atlantic coast, New Jersey and Coney Island especially suffering. Atlantic city was almost submerged, and wrecks, involving the loss of thirty-seven lives, were reported along the coast.

— The British Association met at Newcastle-on-Tyne under the presidency of Professor W. Flower, who chose for the subject of his inaugural address the formation and arrangement of museums.

12. Midway across the Irish Channel, in the midst of a dense fog, the mail steamers *Banshee* and *Irene*, from and for Dublin respectively, came into collision, the former losing her paddle-box and the latter springing a serious leak. Both vessels ultimately arrived at Holyhead without further mishap.

— Serious rioting between Mussulmans and Hindoos took place at Rohtak during the Mahommedan festival of Mohurrow. The police were at length obliged to fire upon the mob, killing and wounding many people.

— The German Emperor and Empress paid a State visit to Hanover, where they were enthusiastically received by the population, the anti-Prussian party giving no sign of its existence.

13. According to an official return the railways of the United Kingdom at the close of the year 1888 had 19,812 miles open for traffic, on which a total capital of 864,695,963*l.* had been expended. The gross receipts amounted to 72,895,000*l.* and the net receipts to 35,133,000*l.* The number of passengers carried was 742,499,000, exclusive of 1,176,909 season ticket holders.

— The Emperor of China issued an edict sanctioning the construction of a railway between Pekin and Hankow, a distance of 700 miles; the first authorised railway in China, a previously constructed line, twelve miles in length, between Woosang and Hankow having been taken up in 1876 in consequence of local superstition and dislike.

14. The strike of the dock labourers, after lasting upwards of a month, terminated with the concession, subject to slight modifications, of the men's demands. The tailors' strike also brought to a close by the basis of a 10½ hours day's work, and overtime not to exceed four hours a week.

16. An extensive vein of uranium discovered in the hills near Grampound in Cornwall, more productive of this rare metal than any hitherto known.

— Work resumed at the docks on the Thames, but in many cases misunderstandings arose between the Unionists and non-Unionists, which gave occasion to serious assaults.

— H.M.S. gunboat *Lily* struck in a dense fog on a sunken reef off Armour Point, Fortean Bay, on the coast of Labrador. After all the boats had been swamped or broken, a seaman volunteered to swim ashore with a rope, and ultimately a hawser was made fast to the rocks, by which the crew, with the exception of seven men, escaped with their lives. The captain and navigating-lieutenant were subsequently found to be in default, and dismissed the ship.

17. Lord Selborne and Mr. Chamberlain, M.P., opened the Unionist campaign in the Midlands by a large meeting at Huddersfield, where they were cordially received.

— A Spanish coasting vessel captured by the Riff pirates off the Barbary coast, and in proximity to the Spanish fortress of Alhucemas. The ship was plundered and destroyed and the crew sent into the interior as slaves.

18. Serious forest fires reported from Oregon, and special precautions found necessary to protect the city of Portland from the advancing flames.

19. At Quebec about 8 p.m. several thousand tons of rock fell from the face of Cape Diamond below the citadel upon Champlain Street, 200 ft. below, carrying down seven dwellings. Forty persons were buried in the ruins, and as many more were seriously injured. Heavy rain following upon a continuance of hot dry weather had, it was supposed, caused the cliff to slip, as in 1841, when a still more serious disaster occurred.

21. The Lancashire Plate (seven furlongs), value 1,200*l.*, won by the Duke of Portland's Donovan, 3 yrs., 9 st. 12 lb. (F. Barrett). Eleven started.

— After much opposition from the Legislative Council, the Bill passed both Chambers of the New South Wales Legislature, sanctioning the payment of members.

22. The French elections, in which the Boulangists expected to be victorious, passed off quite quietly both in Paris and the provinces. The Republicans carried 215 seats, the Royalists 89, the Bonapartists 40, the

Boulangists 21. In 186 districts the results were indecisive, and second ballots requisite.

23. Mr. Gladstone took advantage of the visit of a deputation from Hyde (Cheshire) to make a long political speech on the pending elections.

— The Lord Mayor, in presiding over the opening meeting of the session at Gresham College, expressed the hope that the body would take steps to participate in the scheme of University extension, as the modern equivalent of Sir Thomas Gresham's original idea.

24. The schooner-yacht *Ladybird*, belonging to Mr. Cope, run down off the Needles by the South-Western Company's steamer *Alderney* bound for Cherbourg. There were three ladies and three gentlemen and a crew of seventeen on board the yacht, who were ultimately landed at Hurst and Tolland Bay. The *Ladybird* ultimately got on shore in Poole Bay.

— The Spanish gunboat *Cocodril* having been ordered to the Riff coast, where the Moors had recently plundered a Spanish coasting vessel, sent a pinnace ashore with a flag of truce. The boat was however fired upon and obliged to return to the ship.

— The officer of health reported to the City authorities that St. Mary Woolnoth and two other churches were unfit for use in consequence of the sewers having come into contact with the vaults in which burials had taken place for so many years.

25. The Duke of Westminster's famous racer, Ormonde, which had been sold to Don Juan Bocan of Buenos Ayres for 14,000*l.*, left England on board the s.s. *Elbe*.

— An alarming fire broke out on the premises of Messrs Rylands, warehousemen, Wood Street, Cheapside, where six years previously premises situated on the same ground were completely destroyed. In a few hours, however, the fire was got under, but not until much damage was done to the stock.

— Mr. John Leng (G.L.), editor and proprietor of the *Dundee Advertiser*, elected member for Dundee without opposition, in the place of Mr. J. B. Firth, deceased.

— Lord Brassey made his award in the dispute between the lightermen and their masters, recommending that the men should receive 6*s.* for the day's work of twelve hours, and 1*s.* per hour overtime.

26. The Prefecture Scrutineers declared the votes given to General Boulanger and M. Rochefort to be void, and annulled the election of the former—who had attained the requisite majority—and assigned the seat to his competitor, M. Joffrin.

— The polling in the Sleaford Division of Lincolnshire resulted in the re-election of Mr. H. Chaplin (C.), by 4,336 votes against Mr. F. Otter (G.L.), who polled 3,078.

— The Bank of England advanced its rate of discount from 4 to 5 per cent., the store of bullion being 20,656,584*l.*, and the total reserve 12,398,429*l.*, being 42½ per cent. of the liabilities.

— A shocking murder discovered at Bury, Lancashire, of which the victim, a Mr. Gordon, Jewish tradesman, was found concealed, frightfully mangled, in a wardrobe, which the supposed murderer had sold, and was about to have removed from the shop in which they both lived.

27. A suburb of Birmingham, where the annual onion fair was going on, was thrown into great excitement by the escape of a lion and lioness from Messrs. Wombwell's menagerie. The crowd fled in all directions, but the animals made no attempt to attack man, child or beast, and seemingly were as panic-stricken as the crowd. They took refuge at length in a drain, whence the lioness was with difficulty dislodged and brought back to her cage, the lion remaining in its hiding place for more than thirty-six hours longer.

— A strike of dock labourers at Rotterdam put a stop to all business on the quays and wharves of that city. Several collisions took place between the police and the men, who attempted to prevent Englishmen connected with the steamships from loading their vessels, and at last military aid had to be obtained, and order was ultimately restored.

28. The Western Express of the New York Central Railway which had been despatched in two sections met with a serious accident by which four persons were killed instantaneously and twelve others seriously injured. Whilst the first section was stopping near Palatine Bridge, beyond Albany, the second half dashed into it, telescoping three sleeping cars.

29. A collision took place between two express trains in a tunnel near Ariano on the line between Naples and Foggia. Twenty carriages were smashed to atoms and a large number of passengers killed and wounded.

— Queen Natalie of Servia, who had been in exile for thirteen months, returned to Belgrade to see her son in spite of the opposition of the Ministry and Regents. She was received with wild enthusiasm by the inhabitants.

30. The Paris Tribunal of Commerce gave judgment in the suit of the liquidators of the Comptoir d'Escompte against the persons alleged to be responsible for its collapse. The heirs of M. Denfert-Rochereau (who committed suicide) and five directors were ordered to pay twelve millions, ten other directors less culpably cognisant six millions, and the auditors one million of francs.

— The cotton "corner," which for some weeks had been keeping mill owners and mill hands as well as speculators in suspense, suddenly collapsed, and the price declined to thirty points below the highest market price of the month.

OCTOBER.

1. The twenty-ninth annual Church Congress opened at Cardiff, the Archbishop of Canterbury preaching the opening sermon, and the Bishop of Llandaff giving the opening address.

— A passenger train from Stuttgart was thrown off the line near Wild-path station by a collision with an engine travelling in the opposite direction. Three carriages were broken to pieces, and ten persons killed and forty more seriously injured.

2. The International American Congress, composed of delegates from the various republics of North and South America, met at Washington, Secretary Blaine being elected President. The members were afterwards presented to President Harrison.

— The *German Official Gazette* published a note, apparently drawn up by the Emperor himself, sharply rebuking the *Kreuz Zeitung*—the organ of

the old Conservative Royalists—for suggesting that the Emperor ruled according to the dictates of the Cartel, which was being dominated by the Liberals.

3. At the Marlborough Street Police Court, Mr. Newton found that the members of the Cranbourne Club, Leicester Square, who had been taken into custody on the charge of gambling, were amenable to the law respecting gambling houses, and sentenced the whole of the persons summoned to fines varying from 10*l.* to 50*l.*, or to find recognizances not to gamble again for three months.

— The King of Italy ratified the treaty between Italy and Abyssinia, signed at the camp of Ucciali on May 2, between Count Antonelli and King Menelek of Shoa.

4. An accident occurred on the main line of the London and North-Western Railway, a short distance outside Manchester, on the line to Stockport, a pilot goods train coming into collision with a passenger train. Five persons were killed and nine seriously injured.

— The Kempton Park Breed Producers Stakes for colts and fillies, value 6,000*l.*, won by Mr. Warren de la Rue's Dearest, 8 st. 11 lb. (G. Chalqner), defeating the favourite and a field of twenty-one starters.

— At Aberdeen, Glasgow, and many other places in Scotland, those attending certain of the Board Schools "struck" against long hours of work and home lessons.

5. A meeting, presided over by Lord Rosebery, was held at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, at 1.30 a.m., to consolidate the Omnibus and Tramways Employés Union, and to consult as to means of defence.

— The tailors' strike at the East-end of London brought to a close, through the mediation of Mr. S. Montagu, M.P., the workmen obtaining a reduction of hours and a more regular system of employment.

6. The result of the second ballots for the French elections showed that the new Chamber of Deputies would include 365 Republicans—of whom 120 were Radicals—and 211 Anti-Republicans—of whom about 45 were Boulangists.

7. The polling at Peterborough resulted in the return of Mr. A. C. Morton (G.L.), by 1,893 votes against Mr. Purvis (L.U.), who polled 1,642 votes.

— A furious gale broke over England and Ireland, doing great damage to life and property. A huge rent, fifty feet long and seven broad, was made in the Holyhead Breakwater, and the lighthouse on it was in considerable danger, but eventually weathered the storm. A gunboat, the *Enterprise*, which was being towed to Liverpool, was driven ashore and went to pieces on the rocks, and all round the west coasts of England and Ireland numerous wrecks occurred.

— General Boulanger left England for Jersey, where he proposed to take up his residence.

8. The election for the counties of Elgin and Nairn resulted in favour of Mr. Seymour Keay (G.L.), who polled 2,573 votes against 2,044 given to Mr Logan (L.U.)

— The German Emperor went to Kiel to receive the English fleet under

Admiral Baird, and subsequently went on board the flag-ship in his uniform as an English Admiral of the Fleet.

9. The gas stokers employed by the Bristol Gas Company, having given the necessary notice, came out on strike, and placed pickets round the works to prevent their places being filled by outsiders.

— Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria, suddenly and without warning, left Sofia in order to visit his mother and family at Munich and Styria. M. Stambuloff was appointed Regent in his absence.

— The Middle Park Plate for two-year-olds, at Newmarket, won by Cavaliere Ginistrelli's Signorina, 9 st. (G. Barrett). Nine started.

10. The "temporalities" of Bishop Strossmayer, the Primate of Hungary, placed under sequestration, in consequence of charges brought against him of having cut down large forests of timber without authority.

— The London School Board reassembled after the recess, on which occasion the chairman (Rev. J. R. Diggle) made the usual survey of the Board's work. Mr. Conybeare, M.P., at the close of the meeting, protested very strongly against the legal opinion by which his seat was held to have been vacated by his imprisonment.

— At Newmarket the Cesarewitch won by Mr. W. Goater's Primrose Day, 4 yrs., 6 st. 11 lb. (W. Wood). Twenty-two started.

11. The Czar and Grand Duke George, having left Copenhagen for Kiel, in the Russian Imperial yacht, came to Berlin to return, after many delays, the visit paid to the Czar by the Emperor William on the latter's accession. An imposing if not a cordial reception was given to the Czar by the Berlin public.

— The polling in North Bucks resulted in the return of Captain Verney (G.L.), by 4,855, over Hon. Evelyn Hubbard (C.), brother of the late member, who polled 4,647 votes.

12. The grave of Ralph Waldo Emerson at Concord, Mass., broken into, with the apparent object of rifling its contents, but the robbers were disturbed before they could remove any portion of the body.

— A young Prince Dolgoronkoff, an officer in the Russian guards, called upon to quit Sofia suddenly, on the charge of having attempted to create a revolution in favour of Russia. He was, however, disowned by the Russian legation, and had to quit the country after a brief sojourn.

— At Chicago, where the difficulty of obtaining a jury in the Cronin case still continued, a conspiracy was disclosed for defeating the course of justice, by bribing talesmen who might be placed upon the jury. At the same time it was discovered that some important documents had been stolen from the State Attorney's office.

13. The Czar left Berlin in the course of the day for Ludwigsburg, near Schwerin, as guest of the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg.

14. Mansfield College, erected from designs by Mr. Basil Champneys, the first nonconformist college at Oxford, and due to the transfer of the endowments of Spring Hill College, Birmingham, formally opened with a sermon by Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham. Dr. Fairbairn was elected the first Principal of the college.

14. A sculling match on the Thames championship course between Niel Matterson, of Sydney, N.S.W., and George Bubear, of Putney—one time champion of England—resulted in the easy victory of the colonial oarsman.

— At a late hour of the night the principal streets of New York were thrown into complete darkness, the electric companies having closed the currents in consequence of a dispute with the municipal authorities relative to the dangerous condition of the overhead wires.

15. On the Mount Auburn inclined steam tramway, a car which had reached the summit became detached from the engine drawing them, and running back down the steep incline dashed into another car waiting to ascend. Ten persons were killed outright, and the remainder of the passengers, about twenty, were terribly injured.

— The Swiss Federal Council decided on the expulsion of three German anarchists, who had taken up their quarters at Basle.

16. The members of the International Maritime Conference assembled at Washington, and elected Admiral Franklin, of the United States Navy, as their President.

— A terrible colliery explosion, involving the loss of seventy-two lives, took place at the Mossfield Colliery, Adderley Green, in North Staffordshire.

— General Hippolyte unanimously elected President of the Republic of Hayti.

17. A Scottish gathering of 300 Highlanders, representing the various clans, gave a display of Highland games in Paris.

— A charter of incorporation granted to the Zambesiland Company, giving the directors rights over more than 60,000 square miles on the south-east side of Africa.

18. Dr. James Pollock delivered, at the Royal College of Physicians, the annual Harveian oration, dwelling at some length on the discoveries of M. Pasteur.

— The German Emperor and Empress halted at Monza on their way to Athens, in order to spend a few days with King Humbert.

19. King Louis I. of Portugal died at the palace of Cascaes after a long illness and much suffering. His son was at once proclaimed king, under the title of Charles I.

20. Prince William of Wurtemberg, heir-presumptive to the crown, fired at on his way to church by a man, who, when arrested, gave as his reason for so doing that the country required a Catholic king, but who was subsequently asserted to be an anarchist, selected by lot to attempt the Prince's assassination.

21. On the Zanzibar coast a severe encounter took place between Captain Wissmann, supported by the German Naval Brigade, and Bushiri at the head of 5,000 natives. Of the latter 800 were killed, with a loss of only seven Germans.

— The new maritime railway station at Calais, one of the principal features of the new harbour works, opened for public use.

— The Sultan of Zanzibar announced to the British Agent that all children born after the beginning of the Christian new year (Jan. 1) would be free.

21. The "nonconformist cathedral," a large church built in the fifteenth-century Gothic, for Dr. Allon, a congregationalist, opened at Islington for religious service. The total cost of the building was 50,000*l*.

— An attempt made to assassinate Count Okuma, Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, who escaped with a slight wound.

22. The German Reichstag opened by Commission; the Imperial message, whilst renewing the assurances of a peaceful policy, referred to increased requirements for both the army and navy.

— At the Maryborough Assizes, after a lengthy trial, William Colls, who with Father McFadden and twelve others had been originally indicted for the murder of District-Inspector Martin, at Gweedore, found guilty of manslaughter.

— Archduke John of Austria, a son of the last Grand Duke of Tuscany, applied to the Emperor for leave to lay aside his rank and titles. He had distinguished himself in former years as a military reformer, but met with small encouragement from the Court party, and having gone abroad, he presented himself at Fiume under the assumed name of John Orth, and having passed the examination obtained a certificate as a sailing master in the merchant service.

23. After sitting for nine weeks, during which 1,115 talesmen were examined, a jury was at length formed at Chicago for the trial of the persons accused of the murder of Dr. Cronin.

— Mr. Gladstone, who was staying at Ince-Blundell Hall, visited Stockport, where at the Cambridge Hall he addressed a large and enthusiastic meeting on the political situation.

— Two applications made to the Swiss Federal Council in the course of a few days for a concession to construct a railway up the Jungfrau, one by Herr Koechlin of Zurich, and the other by Herr Frankweiler, the engineer of the Brunig Railway.

— A general strike and lock-out among the dockers at Bristol led to considerable concession on the part of the masters, but failed to altogether satisfy the men.

24. At Newmarket, the Cambridgeshire Stakes won by Mr. J. Hammond's Laureate, 8 yrs., 7 st. 9 lb. (Warne), an outsider, defeating a field of twenty-one starters.

— The sittings of the Parnell Commission resumed, Mr. Biggar, M.P., and Mr. Davitt addressing the judges on their own behalf.

— A man named Dwyer entered the branch office of the Union Bank at Didsbury, near Manchester, fired two shots at the manager, whom he severely wounded, and his assistant, and then seized some handfuls of gold. He was almost immediately pinioned, and, finding escape hopeless, placed the pistol in his mouth and blew out his own brains.

25. The contest at Brighton resulted in the return of Mr. Gerald Loder (C.), who polled 7,182 votes against 4,265 given to Sir Robert Peel (G.L.).

— Mr. Barnum's "Show" arrived from New York at Milford Haven by the steamship *City of Rome*, of the Anchor Line, that port having been tried experimentally as an alternative to Liverpool.

25. No less than twenty-three separate shocks of earthquake occurred on the island of Lesbos, the majority of which were felt throughout the *Ægean* Sea, and some as far away as Smyrna.

26. The funeral of King Louis of Portugal took place at Lisbon, the cortège passing from the Church of Los Geronimos, where the body had lain in state, to the Pantheon of San Vincente de Fora, the burial-place of the princes of the House of Braganza. The procession, which was of great length, was received by the populace with every token of respect, and the funeral service was attended by the representatives of the Government and royal families of Europe, and for the first time a special envoy from the Sultan was present at a Catholic service.

27. The marriage of the Duke of Sparta, eldest son of King George of the Hellenes, with Princess Sophia of Prussia, sister of the German Emperor, celebrated at Athens, with unusual splendour. In addition to the Emperor and Empress of Germany, the Empress Frederick (Princess Royal of England), the Prince of Wales, the Czarewitch, and the King and Queen of Denmark, and many other members of the reigning families of Europe, were present.

— The roadway by Constitution Hill, connecting Buckingham Palace and Hyde Park Corner, thrown open to the public use, except at such times as the Queen is residing in London.

28. The Congress of the National Association for the Advancement of Art opened at Edinburgh by an address from the Marquess of Lorne, K.T., who urged the necessity of arousing an art feeling in all classes in order to meet foreign competition.

— The first meeting of the Tenants' Real Defence Association, intended to take the place of the Land League, held at Thurles, and addressed by many Irish Nationalist members.

29. At the Maryborough Assizes, five prisoners, against whom true bills had been found for the murder of Inspector Martin at Gweedore, pleaded guilty to manslaughter, whilst Father McFadden and nine others pleaded guilty to obstructing the police in the lawful execution of their duties. Sentences, varying from six months to ten years, pronounced against all, except Father McFadden, who was liberated on his own recognisances.

30. The Great Seal of the United Kingdom affixed to the charter of the British South Africa Company, assigning to it trading and other rights over a territory of vast extent, with the express reservation to the Crown to take over at any time the works and buildings of the Company.

31. The royal guests at Athens separated, after prolonged festivities, the Prince of Wales leaving for Egypt. When at Port Said he took leave of his eldest son, who sailed for India; the Emperor and Empress of Germany starting for Constantinople, the rest of the party returning to their respective homes, with the exception of the Empress Frederick.

— At an early hour of the morning, and some time after the close of the performances of the previous night, the Victoria Theatre, Stalybridge, a large building, completely destroyed by fire.

— An extensive fire also destroyed a large portion of the shipbuilding yard of Messrs. Westwood, Baillie and Co., at Millwall, involving the loss of many thousands of pounds.

NOVEMBER.

1. The consecration by the Archbishop of Canterbury of Archdeacon Randall as Suffragan Bishop of Oxford; of Dr. E. Ash Were, as Suffragan Bishop of Derby; and of Dr. C. J. Corfe as Missionary Bishop of Corea, took place in Westminster Abbey.

— The results of the municipal elections throughout England and Wales showed a net gain to the Liberals of about sixty seats on the Town Councils.

— A sexton of Peterborough Cathedral committed suicide by hanging himself in the bell tower. His death gave rise to a controversy as to the necessity of reconsecrating the Cathedral, but the point was ultimately decided by the Chapter in the negative.

— During a heavy gale the weaving shed at Messrs. Templeton's, carpet manufacturers, at Glasgow, collapsed, burying upwards of 100 women, of whom 29 were killed on the spot, and many others seriously injured.

2. The German Emperor and Empress arrived at Constantinople and disembarked at the Palace of Dolma Bagtché, whence they drove to the quarters prepared for them in the Yıldız Kiosk. Their reception by the Sultan and the people of Stambul was most hearty and impressive.

— The Emperor of Austria attended a requiem service in the room of the Château de Mayerling, where the Crown Prince Rudolph died, now the chapel of the nunnery, into which the Château had been converted.

3. Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria returned from his journey, having visited several of his relations, and shortly after his arrival at Sofia opened the Session of the Sobranje.

4. A baronetcy conferred upon the Lord Mayor (Whitehead) in recognition of his public services during the year of his mayoralty.

— A magnificent illumination of both sides of the Bosphorus, from Yıldız to the Golden Horn, including all the palaces and public buildings, took place in honour of the German Emperor and Empress.

— The first week of the new rates of pay to dock labourers marked by a strike of lightermen to the number of about 5,000, demanding a rearrangement of the scale for night jobs.

5. News reached England that Emin Pasha and Mr. Jephson had been prisoners in the hands of the Mahdists, or of their own revolted troops, since August, 1888, that they had been rescued by Stanley and enabled to escape on account of his advance upon the Albert Nyanza, and that Equatorial Africa had wholly fallen under the rule of the Mahdists.

6. News reached Zanzibar of the massacre of Dr. Peters and his party—with one exception—by the Masais or Somalis, amongst whom he was attempting to settle a German colony.

— In the United States, the "fall" elections showed a considerable increased Democratic vote in the majority of the States polled.

— The Paris Exhibition closed with a grand illumination of the buildings

and Eiffel Tower. It had been visited by enormous numbers of people, especially Frenchmen from the provinces.

7. Lord Rosebery and Sir John Lubbock re-elected respectively chairman and vice-chairman of the London County Council without opposition, and Mr. Hayter deputy chairman by 61 to 51, the salary of the post having been previously reduced to 1,500*l.* per annum.

8. Two American politicians, Colonel Goodloe and Colonel Swope, who had quarrelled over the bestowal of offices, consequent upon the change of President, met in the Lexington Post Office. Colonel Swope drew a pistol and fired, and Colonel Goodloe immediately did the same. After several shots on both sides, the former fell dead, and the latter was so severely wounded that he survived only a few hours.

— During his stay at Poonah, Prince Albert Victor met with two accidents on the same day. His elephant stumbled whilst mounting the Palratti, and later in the day his horses bolted whilst driving. In neither case did the Prince receive any hurt.

— The Great Northern Railway of Ireland between Drogheda and Carrickmacoon strictly boycotted, traders, farmers, and others being ordered to make no use of the line. The reason assigned was that a station-master had leased a house of which the former tenant had been evicted.

9. The 700th anniversary of the mayoralty of London celebrated by an imposing procession from the City to Charing Cross. Among the new features were groups illustrating the sports and pastimes of Old England, and a procession of English worthies claiming descent from Lord Mayors of London.

— At the Guildhall Banquet, Lord Salisbury, in replying on behalf of Her Majesty's Ministers, dwelt at some length on the "scramble for Africa" going on among the European powers.

— After a prolonged trial at Edinburgh, John Watson Laurie, *alias* Annandale, was found guilty of murdering his companion, Edwin Rose, on a walking tour on the Goatfell, Arran. He was sentenced to death, but he was ultimately reprieved on the ground of insanity.

11. The conference of the Liberal Unionists and Conservatives of Birmingham, relative to the future representation of the various divisions of the town, agreed, by 8 votes to 6, after a long discussion, to refer the point at issue to the arbitration of Lords Salisbury and Hartington.

— In the Queen's Bench, Mr. Justice Denman decided to hear *in camera* a case to recover damages for libel in connection with the dismissal of certain masters of Sherborne School.

12. Sir Sydney Waterlow announced his intention to present to the public a park of 29 acres on the southern slope of Highgate Hill, and at the same time forwarded to the County Council the sum of 6,000*l.* for the purpose of laying out and enclosing the new park.

— The German Emperor and Empress reached Venice on their return journey, where they were received with great enthusiasm. They were escorted from Malmorco by a crowd of boats of all kinds, and, on the arrival of the Imperial yacht at its anchorage, the Emperor and his party were conveyed to the railway station in the *Scala*, the State barge with sixteen rowers, and the successor to the *Bucentaur*.

13. The Catholic Congress assembled at Baltimore, which had been attended by a large number of American prelates, concluded its sittings, and subsequently entertained at a banquet at Washington, at which the President and Secretary of State were present.

— The Sultan issued an Imperial Iradé, sanctioning the erection of a Protestant Chapel at Bethlehem, a wish long entertained and favoured by the German Empress.

— The annual Colston Banquets took place at Bristol, Sir M. Hicks-Beach and Mr. Goschen being the principal speakers at the Dolphin, and Lord Rosebery at the Anchor Society.

14. A second meeting of the Emperors Francis Joseph and William took place at Innsbruck on the occasion of the German Emperor passing through that city.

— A meeting of London tradesmen held in St. James's Hall to demand fair rent, fixity of licence, and compensation for improvements.

— The bursting of a mill dam in the village of Alton, Ontario, resulted in the serious inundation of a large tract of country, six other dams and four bridges being carried away.

15. A meeting of the Imperial Federation League held at the Mansion House under the presidency of the Lord Mayor. Lord Rosebery was the principal speaker.

— After four days' trial the case of *Mrs. Besant v. Rev. E. Hoskyns*, for libel at the recent School Board elections, resulted in the discharge of the jury, who were unable to agree upon their verdict.

— A revolutionary movement, of which the first open manifestation was the attempted assassination of the Minister of Marine, Baron de Ladario, broke out at Rio de Janeiro. The army supported the movement, and the Ministry, to avoid bloodshed, at once resigned. A Provisional Government under General Deodoro da Fonseca was at once formed, which abolished the Council of State and proclaimed a republic. The Emperor, who had been kept a prisoner in his palace, was two days later escorted on board a steamer sailing for Europe.

16. In the French Chamber of Deputies, M. Floquet was elected President by 384 votes.

— The threatened strike of the London bakers averted by a general agreement of the masters to the men's demands for shorter hours. The employés of the London Road Car Company, who had threatened to strike for twelve hours' work a day, agreed to postpone action, at the request of the directors, until the London General Omnibus Company had decided upon the course it proposed to take in presence of a similar demand. At Burton-on-Trent there was a general strike of the men engaged in the malt-houses for an advance to 8*d.* per hour. The breweries of Messrs. Bass and others consented to the terms, but other firms having refused the men came out.

18. The Anti-Slavery Conference assembled at Brussels, and were received by the Prince de Chimay in the name of the King and of the Belgian Government. Baron Lambremont was elected President, at the request of the Prince de Chimay, to whom the post was first offered.

— At Vienna a general strike occurred among the workers in mother-of-

pearl, of which industry the headquarters were in the Austrian capital. The masters in this case sided with their workmen against the exporters, who wished to undersell in all foreign markets.

19. The British steamer *Santiago*, 4,188 tons register trading between New York and Hull, totally burnt at sea. The passengers and crew were rescued after having been a night and day in open boats.

— Sir Edward Guinness, the head of the great Irish Brewing Company, placed in the hands of trustees 250,000*l.* for erecting dwellings for the labouring poor—50,000*l.* to be spent in Dublin, and the remainder in London.

— Mr. S. B. Bristowe, Q.C., a County Court Judge, shot at and severely wounded on the Nottingham platform by a German dentist named Arnemann, against whom the judge had given an adverse decision during the day.

— Mr. John Morley, as the guest of the Eighty Club, discussed the several questions which would require settlement when the Irish question had been got out of the way.

20. The mildness of the season in Kent and other parts of England marked by a profusion of violets, cherry trees in blossom—and near Sittingbourne a field of poppies was in full bloom.

— News reached Berlin that Stanley and Emin Pasha had on the 10th September after many engagements and difficulties reached Usukuma, on the Isanga river, with a portion of their troops and all the Europeans, including Captain Casati; and that on 10th November he had reached the German settlement at Mpwapa.

— The National Palace at San Salvador destroyed by fire, and the Government archives consumed.

21. The students at the Glasgow University made a strong demonstration against the Senate for attempting to carry out the graduation ceremony in a small building—Randolph Hall—instead of in Bute Hall. Principal Caird and other professors were mobbed, and narrowly escaped being severely handled.

— At the meeting of the London School Board, it was found necessary to borrow 150,000*l.* to make good the defective building of many of the schools. The clerk of the works was dismissed for negligence, and notice was given of proceedings against the contractors.

— The French Ministry defeated in the Chamber of Deputies, on a proposal to establish a State monopoly of match-making.

22. The Parnell Commission met for the 128th and last time. The President, on the close of Sir Henry James's speech, which had lasted 12 days, announced that the Court would consider its judgment.

— At Gross Becskerek, in Hungary, at the Assize Court, the trial began of 57 women, of the Servo-Hungarian village of Meleneze, charged with poisoning their husbands and other relatives. There were originally 80 implicated, but of these 23 had either fled or died before proceedings were commenced. The poisons were obtained from two professional fortune-tellers, who were arrested in 1882, and who died in prison during the seven years spent in collecting evidence.

23. The protected cruiser *Blake*, the largest ship built for the Royal Navy for upwards of 25 years, launched at Chatham. Her cost, according to the estimates, was to be 213,000*l.* for hull and fittings, 134,000*l.* for engines, &c., and 20,000*l.* for gun mountings, torpedo carriages, &c.

— The Sultan ordered an amnesty to be offered to all who had taken part in the recent disturbances at Crete, excepting only those guilty of offences against common law.

24. A severe gale, lasting only a few hours, passed over the South of England and Ireland. At Sandgate the sea wall was seriously damaged, and the tramway and main roads rendered impassable.

25. The King of Italy opened the Italian Parliament in person, and in his speech, whilst anticipating peace, promised that the army and navy would be maintained in the highest state of efficiency.

— Sir Michael Morris, Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, appointed Law Lord in the place of Lord Fitzgerald deceased.

— The weather in England, which had been up to this time remarkably mild, suddenly became wintry, heavy snow falling in the Lake district and the Midlands.

26. A great fire, extending over a square mile, at Lynn (Massachusetts) destroyed among other buildings thirty-five shoe factories, all the newspaper offices, and the Boston and Maine railway depot. It continued to rage unchecked for eight hours, defying all the efforts of the firemen. The property destroyed was estimated at ten million dollars.

— The French Chamber of Deputies annulled the election of Count Dillon for L'Orient, on the ground of ineligibility.

— The National Union of Conservative Associations assembled at Nottingham, and in the evening Lord Salisbury addressed a large assembly upon the formation of a national party and its programme of legislation.

27. The Guards' memorial in Brompton Cemetery to 1,000 comrades interred there unveiled by General Stephenson, and at St. Bride's Church, Fleet Street, a memorial brass to Richardson the novelist unveiled, in the presence of the Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company.

— Mr. Corvillain, the proprietor of the cartridge factory at Antwerp, which blew up in September, sentenced to four-and-a-half years', and M. Delauney, the manager, to eighteen months' imprisonment, and ordered to pay 12,000 francs damages and the costs of the trial.

— An important conference of miners from all parts of the kingdom met at Newport (Mon.) to discuss questions relating to wages and hours of labour. A large body of delegates were present, and Mr. Pickard, M.P., was elected chairman. After a prolonged debate a resolution to send out notices to terminate contracts in order to limit them to eight hours from bank to bank, was supported by 44 votes; a rider that the question should be for the present adjourned received 73 votes; and an amendment to attempt to obtain the eight hours by Act of Parliament, 50 votes. The original motion having been thus negatived, a second vote was taken, and the rider to adjourn the question received 100, and the amendment 20 votes.

28. A fire, little less disastrous than that scarcely extinguished at Lynn, broke out in Boston (Mass.), by which the shoe and leather exchange, and

the offices of the Western Union Exchange Company, and two hundred of the largest dry-goods stores were destroyed. Engines were sent from all the neighbouring towns, but two acres of buildings were destroyed before the firemen obtained mastery over the flames. The origin of the fire was attributed to the fusing of an electric wire.

28. An attempt to blow up the offices of the Rochdale School Board by a canister containing 12 lbs. blasting powder frustrated by the discovery of the "machine" before the explosion took place.

29. St. William's Fever Hospital, Rochester, took fire, and with great difficulty the patients, of whom there were luckily only twenty-five, were rescued and conveyed to another part of the building.

— An epidemic of influenza prevailed to an extraordinary extent in a large number of the cities of Russia and Siberia. At St. Petersburg it was especially severe, more than 50 per cent. of the population, from the Imperial family and Ambassador downwards, being attacked. It was ascribed to the long delayed frost, which had not set in at the usual period.

— The German Emperor conferred upon Field Marshal Count Moltke the Crown of the Badge of Honour, on the fiftieth anniversary of the day on which the order "Pour le Mérite" had been conferred upon him by the Emperor William I.

30. At the anniversary meeting of the Royal Society, the following medals were presented:—Copley medal, to Rev. Dr. Salmon, for distinction in the science of pure mathematics; Davy medal, to Dr. Perkin, for researches on magnetic rotation; Royal medal, to Dr. Gaskets, for researches in cardiac physiology, and Dr. Thorpe for his researches in fluorine compounds, &c.

— The official jubilee of Anton Rubinstein's musical career, coinciding with the sixtieth anniversary of his birth, celebrated with great enthusiasm at St. Petersburg, the Duke George of Mecklenburg-Strelitz presiding over a meeting at the Nobles' Assembly Rooms, and presenting the musician with a gold medal struck for the occasion.

— A fire at Minneapolis totally destroyed a block of buildings eight storeys high, partly occupied by the *Tribune* newspaper offices. Of seventy-five compositors at work on the seventh floor, ten were burnt to death before any help could be given, and many others met their death, including Professor Olsen, of South Dakota University, a distinguished Greek scholar.

DECEMBER.

2. A severe snowstorm, lasting for nearly thirty-six hours, raged over a great portion of Eastern Austria and Hungary. Traffic was everywhere impeded, if not entirely stopped, and even the municipal arrangements for clearing away the snow in the capital proved ineffectual.

— Mr. Gladstone attended the annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation at Manchester, and in the evening addressed a large and enthusiastic audience at the Free Trade Hall, and again on the following day, upwards of 3,500 delegates from various parts of the kingdom attending.

3. A serious fire broke out in the upper floor of the headquarters of the Salvation Army in Queen Victoria and Upper Thames Streets.

— President Harrison's message to Congress expressed the hope that the Pan-American Conference would pave the way to improved commercial relations, and secure peace on the American continent. The past year showed an excess of nearly nine millions sterling of revenue over expenditure, and the current year promised to give as much, and the President urged Congress to take measures to reduce this unnecessary raising of revenue.

4. Mr. A. J. Balfour entertained by the Unionists of Scotland at a grand banquet held in the Waverley Market, Edinburgh. The Duke of Fife presided, and covers were laid for 2,700 persons.

— The gas stokers (to the number of about 7,000) of the South Metropolitan Gas Company gave notice of their decision to come out on strike unless certain new regulations as to payment, contingent on the profits of the company, were withdrawn.

5. Emin Pasha, who had reached Bagamoyo in safety (in company with Stanley and others) met with a serious accident. Owing to his short sight he fell through a window and fractured his skull.

— The gunboat *Watchful*, on fishery service in the North Sea, grounded when coming into Lowestoft harbour, and became deeply imbedded in the sand. After two days' delay she was got off in safety.

6. The stokers, &c., employed by the Manchester and Salford gas works having gone out on strike, the inhabitants were reduced to a limited supply of gas. In many places business had to be abandoned for want of light.

7. The ex-Emperor of Brazil and his family arrived at Lisbon, where they were received in great state by the King and chief ministers, who went to meet them in the royal barges.

— The influenza epidemic, which had been widely spread over Russia, declared itself almost simultaneously at Berlin and Vienna, hundreds of persons at both places being affected. In a few days its presence was recognised in most of the large centres on the continent, and cases were reported in London and the neighbourhood.

9. A remarkably low tide in the Thames, the water falling 20 ft. 9 in. below high-water level. A large number of vessels, including five steam-boats, grounded above bridge, and the passengers brought on shore in small boats.

— The French Chamber of Deputies invalidated the votes given to General Boulanger in the Montmartre district of Paris, and subsequently recognised the claim of M. Joffrin to the seat, that he had polled a majority of half the electors after those given to his opponent had been nullified.

10. The Emperor William II., who had made a tour of the minor German Courts, received at Frankfort with remarkable enthusiasm, and very imposing ceremonial.

— A panic, arising out of a false alarm of fire at the Johnstown (Pennsylvania) Opera House, a small condemned theatre, caused the death of twelve persons, fatal injuries to twelve others, and lesser injuries to many more.

11. The funeral of Mr. Jefferson Davis, the some time President of the

"Confederate States," took place at New Orleans amid general manifestations of respect and sorrow. Memorial services were simultaneously held in several places in the Southern States.

11. By an unexpected coincidence, at the same time the President attended the House of Representatives at Washington, to celebrate the centenary of the inauguration of George Washington as first president of the United States.

12. Sir M. Shaw Stewart, Lord Lieutenant of Renfrewshire, unveiled in Paisley Abbey a monument erected by the Queen to the memory of the Royal Stuarts buried in the Abbey grounds.

— Mr. Robert Browning, the poet, died at his son's residence in Venice.

— The low lands of Scotland, Lincolnshire, and Sussex invaded by an enormous number of rats; all efforts to keep them in check proved useless.

13. The gas stokers employed in the South Metropolitan gas works, to the number of about 8,000, came out on strike. Their places were, however, promptly filled by men brought from various parts of the country.

— News reached this country that Major Serpa Pinto, the Portuguese representative in Nyassaland, had been laying claim in the name of his Government to large tracts of country declared to be within the scope of British influence.

14. The Earl of Zetland installed at Dublin Castle as Viceroy of Ireland. He was well received by the populace on his arrival.

15. The body of Robert Browning conveyed in solemn state to the cemetery of San Michele, at Venice, and temporarily deposited there prior to its removal to Westminster Abbey.

16. After a trial lasting over six weeks, and after being locked up for nearly three days, the jury in the Cronin trial at Chicago found three of the prisoners guilty of murder, and sentenced them to imprisonment for life, another prisoner to three years' imprisonment. The fifth one accused, Beggs, was acquitted.

— Bushiri, the most troublesome of the Arab chiefs opposing the German East African Company, having been taken by Major Wissmann, tried by court martial, and hanged for cruelties and outrages against natives and foreigners.

— The Netherlands steamship *Leerdam*, bound from Amsterdam to Buenos Ayres, with 600 emigrants, came into collision with the West Hartlepool s.s. *Gaw Quan Sia*, bound from Singapore to Hamburg, and manned chiefly by Malays. Both ships sank, but the passengers and crews which had taken to the boats were, with the exception of two men, saved by a passing ship after twelve hours' exposure, the sea being exceptionally calm, but the weather very foggy.

17. A postman in the act of delivering letters at an office in Hatton Garden was attacked by two men, who after a severe struggle struck him senseless and carried off the mail bag, which they supposed to contain a large number of diamonds received by the Cape mail, but which contained jewels to the value of about 2,000*l.* only, and cheques and bills to the value of 1,600*l.*

— Mr. Parnell, M.P., visited Nottingham, where he met with an enthusi-

astic reception. He subsequently addressed a large meeting on the subject of the wants of Ireland.

17. The Court of Appeal reversed the decision of the Divisional Court of Queen's Bench, which had given a judgment compelling the Bishop of London to hear the "St. Paul's Reredos" case.

18. The influenza epidemic established throughout Europe, from St. Petersburg to Madrid. In many towns the theatres had to be closed, the schools broken up, and even business to some extent suspended in consequence of the numerous cases, none of which, however, were reported to be fatal.

— At University College, Mr. Walter Budge, in the presence of a large company, unrolled a mummy which for many years had been in the College Museum. It was supposed that the mummy belonged to a period from 800 to 1000 B.C., and was that of an Egyptian of the middle class. The body was found to be in a very good state of preservation.

19. Mr. Parnell, after staying with Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden, attended a crowded meeting at the Liverpool Reform Club, where he was presented with 8,500*l.*, "the offerings of many thousands," towards the expenses of his defence.

— A counter revolution in favour of the expelled monarchy attempted by certain soldiers, supported by naval officers and men, but suppressed after some severe street fighting in the city of Rio de Janeiro.

20. The German Theatre at Buda-Pesth completely destroyed by fire. It had for some years been condemned by the municipal authorities as a source of great danger, and it was fortunate that no performance was going on at the time of its being burnt.

— Prince Albert Victor arrived at Rangoon, and was cordially received by the Burmese and Chinese.

21. Mr. O'Brien's application for a new trial in his case against Lord Salisbury for libel refused by the Divisional Court.

— After a meeting of the Cabinet a telegram despatched to Cape Town, ordering H.M.S. *Raleigh* and two other ships to proceed instantly to Delagoa Bay.

— After an existence of 315 years, the Ancient Court of Burgesses of the City and Liberties of Westminster met for the last time in special session to hear summonses taken out by the Inspector of Weights and Measures. The duties of the court were taken over, and its jurisdiction superseded by the London County Council.

23. H.M.S. *Sultan* arrived safely at Portsmouth from Malta, having made the voyage unassisted by her consorts.

— A prize fight between Jem Smith, the English, and Slavin, the Australian, champion, took place near Bruges. The Australian throughout had the best of it, but at the fourteenth round the roughs broke into the ring and attacked Slavin, and prevented the defeat of their friend.

— The Earl of Jersey appointed Paymaster-General, a purely honorary office, in succession to the Earl Brownlow.

24. Wm. Dukes, aged 28, executed at Manchester for the murder at Bury

of his employer, George Gordon, whose body he had attempted to conceal in a wardrobe which he had sold.

24. In the "Christmas" markets at Covent Garden a very remarkable absence of berried holly was observed, very small supplies coming from any part, and as much as a pound being paid for a single branch.

25. A serious fire, by which a very large amount of property was destroyed, broke out in a large newspaper printing establishment in Charterhouse Square, at one time threatening to spread to the old buildings of the Hospital.

— A violent shock of earthquake felt in Sicily, at Aci Reale, and in the neighbouring villages. Several houses were thrown down, and some lives lost.

26. The weather in the United States reported to be of unwonted mildness; on the great lakes, which are generally more or less frozen by the middle of November, the steamship traffic continued. At New York the thermometer reached 66°, and at Pittsburg 80°. Tremendous gales and heavy thunderstorms prevailed during the night in various parts of the North-Eastern States, doing much damage.

— The influenza epidemic, which was raging with severity all over Europe, and especially fatal in Paris and Vienna, showed itself in a mild form in New York and other sea-port towns.

— The Second Indian National Congress assembled at Bombay, under the presidency of Sir David Wedderburn. Simultaneously the Mahomedans held a meeting to protest against any extension of administrative power to natives.

27. Mr. Henry Stanley and Mr. Bonny commenced proceedings in the Consular Court of Zanzibar against Tippoo Tib, for breach of contract and bad faith, claiming 10,000*l.* damages.

— Eight negro prisoners, awaiting trial at Barnwell, South Carolina, for two murders, were lynched by a body of masked men, who surrounded the prison and overpowered the gaolers.

— An accident occurred to an express train on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, near White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, whilst crossing a high embankment on Jary's Run. It left the rails and turned over. Ten persons were killed on the spot, and twenty-five injured.

28. King Charles of Portugal, having taken the oath of fidelity to the constitution before the Cortes and received the keys of the city from the Mayor, was subsequently proclaimed King from the balcony of the Royal Palace at Lisbon, with the usual ceremonial. The festivities were, however, greatly curtailed in consequence of the sudden death of the ex-Empress of Brazil at Oporto.

29. Mr. Gladstone celebrated his eightieth birthday, receiving upwards of 3,000 congratulatory letters and telegrams from all classes and all countries.

30. The Pope held a secret Consistory at the Vatican, at which he conferred the Hat upon the newly-created Cardinals (the Archbishops of Paris, Lyons, and Prague) preconised several Archbishops and Bishops, and conferred the pallium upon the new Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem.

— The Bank of England unexpectedly raised its minimum rate of dis-

count to six per cent. in anticipation of a drain of gold to Paris and New York. The last occasion on which this rate had been reached was January 30, 1882.

30. According to a return drawn up by Mr. M. B. Huish, the amount of benefactions to art galleries and museums during the decade 1880-89 was, for buildings, 347,500*l.*; in pictures and money, 559,000*l.*

31. The body of Robert Browning brought from Venice, laid with solemn ceremony in Westminster Abbey, the spot chosen being close to the monuments to Chaucer and Cowley.

— An anonymous benefactor announced by letter to the President of the College of Surgeons his wish to establish a Hospital Convalescent Home, which he proposed to endow with a sum of 100,000*l.*

— Three men executed—two at Leeds, and one at Maidstone—for the murder of their respective wives.

— The Maritime Conference, which had been sitting for some weeks at Washington, broke up after having agreed upon a few minor points for the better ensuring of life and property at sea.

— The steamship *City of Paris* reached Queenstown from New York in 5 days 22 hours 50 minutes, the fastest eastward passage on record.

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART IN 1889.

LITERATURE.

IN the literature of the year there is obviously no book which is entitled to take precedence of the Duchess of Cleveland's three volumes on **The Battle Abbey Roll, with some Account of the Norman Lineages** (Murray). The Duchess has reconstructed the Roll by collating "its two acknowledged copies—Holinshed's and Duchesne's"—with the rhyming list of Leland, and out of the total of seven hundred and forty names thus acquired claims to have identified all but eleven. For such a task no little labour, and a great deal of material and of research, was required, and in these volumes there is considerable evidence that they have been procured or given. And if we cannot entirely concur in the results, at least we may freely admit the mass of interesting genealogical information, and the valuable sketches of the history of some old families, in which the book abounds. A more solid contribution to history, however, will be found in the second volume of Professor Gardiner's **History of the Great Civil War** (Longmans). In this volume Mr. Gardiner brings us down to the beginning of the critical year 1647 and breaks off at the point where the King was given up by the Scots to the English Parliament. In the earlier chapters we have a full account of the rising differences between the Presbyterians and Independents which led to the self-denying ordinances; we have a chapter devoted to Laud's execution, another on the much-debated mission of Glamorgan, and two or three brilliant chapters on the doings of the Scottish Royalists and the battles of Montrose. The middle part of the book is taken up with an account of Naseby and of the sieges, marches, and vicissitudes which followed, and Mr. Gardiner discusses at length the intricate negotiations of 1645 and 1646 and the failure of the many schemes of help from Ireland to which Charles constantly looked. As usual, Mr. Gardiner's narrative is conspicuously clear and able, and as usual singularly fair. Another page of English history is dealt with in Mr. Francis Aidan Gasquet's book upon **Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries** (Hodges), of which the second volume appears this year. The author is a monk of the order of St. Benedict, and his object is avowedly to show, by examining the history of the suppression of the monasteries, that they were in many cases, if not in most, unjustly condemned. Mr. Gasquet begins this volume by discussing the dissolution of the lesser monasteries and then goes on to deal with the various risings which were connected with

the famous Pilgrimage of Grace. There are interesting chapters on the fall of the Friars and on the three Benedictine Abbots, and there is a useful discussion of the manner in which the spoil was disposed of, and of the results—generally speaking, the unfortunate results—which followed the suppression. Coming down to a later period of English history, we have an amusing book by Mr. Inderwick, called *Side Lights on the Stuarts* (Sampson Low). Mr. Inderwick does justice to James I., and pays a good deal of attention to Arabelle Stuart, many of whose letters are reproduced. He gives us plenty of bright writing and picturesque incident, some gossip, and a very fair proportion of useful fact. The most valuable part of the book is that which is devoted to Monmouth's rebellion, in connection with which Mr. Inderwick prints in full the Gaol Book of the Western Circuit for 1685 and 1686, containing the names and sentences of those concerned in the revolt. And perhaps the most curious part is the paper upon witchcraft, and the illustrations which it gives of our forefathers' belief in that crime. Other details as to the days of the Stuarts are to be found in Mr. Davenport Adams' two volumes entitled, for no apparent reason, *The White King* (Redway). Mr. Adams does not attempt to offer us serious history, but gives us some gossip sketches and portraits of the Court of Charles I., and of the "men and women, life and manners, literature and art of England in the first half of the seventeenth century." The book is light, but has some readable biographical details about some of the literary figures of the time. We shall probably find more reliable history in the little volume on *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.* which Mr. Osmund Airey has contributed to Messrs. Longmans' *Epochs of Modern History*. Mr. Airey's work begins with the year 1648, and deals with the long and interesting period of French ascendancy in Europe—the Fronde and the perplexities and statecraft of Mazarin, the shameless hectoring and chicanery by which the great Louis extended his frontiers, the faithless leagues and discreditable bribery which secured for him the alliance of Charles II., the humiliation of the Dutch republicans, and the dominant influence of Louis on the Continent. In covering such a period Mr. Airey has to cope with a very great mass of detail and a wide variety of subjects, but, even in spite of his narrowly limited space, he contrives to do so adequately and clearly. Before we leave the Stuarts altogether we must mention the admirable reproduction, published by Messrs. Blades, of Thomas Dineley's original manuscript work upon *The Official Progress of the First Duke of Beaufort through Wales in 1684*. The journey seems to have been undertaken by Beaufort to revive in the Principality the waning enthusiasm for the illustrious house from which he sprang, and Dineley's work is in the main a topographical book written in the form of a diary of the Duke's progress. It is full of side-lights on the manners and life of the gentry of the West, with several spirited sketches, and plenty of discursive information as to the political sentiments of the people. Mr. Banks has written a useful preface, and the book is altogether an interesting contribution to a little-known chapter of Welsh history. In this connection we ought to mention a little volume of *Letters from Wales* (Allen), reprinted from the *Times*, which has recently been issued. It deals with the political questions of the day as they specially affect Wales, and chiefly with relation to the land, the Church, and the tithe. The author repudiates the name of Welsh Nationalist, but claims to be counted among the lovers of Wales.

A different type of history will be found in Professor Rawlinson's *History of Phœnicia* (Longmans). Canon Rawlinson begins with a geographical

description of the scene in which his history is placed, and depicts carefully the value of the plains and rivers, the climate, the vegetation, the zoology and mineral wealth of the country. Then he goes on to discuss the deeper questions of the origin of the Phœnician people, the rise of their important cities, and the foundation of their far-spread colonies. One chapter is devoted to architecture; another to an account of æsthetic art in Phœnicia; others to the manufactures, the commerce, the mining, the religion and social habits, and the literature of the people; and all alike are marked by thoroughness and learning. The last chapter, and the longest, deals entirely with the political history of the country, and divides it into eight distinct periods, beginning with the history of Phœnicia before the establishment of the Hegemony of Tyre, and following the narrative down through the long vicissitudes of Phœnician subjection to the Assyrians, to Babylon, to Persia, to Macedon, to the Greeks, and lastly to the Romans. A useful index completes the book. Another work which stands upon the borderland between secular and sacred history is Dr. Koelle's **Mohammed and Mohammedanism** (Rivingtons), in which the writer, who has had a wide experience of the views of religious Mohammedans, endeavours, not without success, to cast some fresh light on an interesting subject. Dr. Koelle begins by considering Mohammed as "developing into the prophet he became," and discusses, under a series of rather singular headings, the "political factor," the "religious factor," the "ancestral or family factor," and the "personal factor," which combined to make up the prophet. The second chapter is a history of Mohammed as prophet, and with that chapter the first book, entitled "Mohammed viewed in the daylight of history," comes to an end. Book II. is called, for purposes of antithesis, "Mohammed viewed in the moonshine of tradition," and discusses the various Moslem sketches and biographies of the prophet. Book III. is occupied with an account of "Mohammedanism viewed in its historical position, especially as regards its relation to Christianity and Christendom." There is an appendix on the prophet's conjugal relations, and another on his descendants. A very different branch of history is dealt with in the **History of South Africa** (Sonnenschein), which Mr. G. M. Theal, taking up his narrative where his first volume left it, has now brought down, in three subsequent volumes, from 1691 to 1872. Mr. Theal has done much to examine the records of the Dutch East India Company's career in South Africa, and he gives as minute a history as any student is likely to wish for of the Dutch dominion in that quarter of the globe. Passing on from that period, he considers in detail the later annals of South Africa, the growth and vicissitudes of its republics, and the tangled relations of the European invaders and the native tribes. The history ends with the acquisition by Great Britain, under Lord Kimberley's administration of the Colonial Office, of the diamond district now known as Griqualand West.

A less solid and learned contribution to history, but for light minds a more readable one, is the volume on the **Hansa Towns** which Miss Helen Zimmern has written for the series called **The Story of the Nations** (Fisher Unwin). This little book claims to be the "first history of the Hanseatic League," and describes well a picturesque episode in European history. Beginning with the origin of the trade guilds in the North German towns, Miss Zimmern tells the story of their federation and early struggles for commerce and freedom, then passes on to the period of their glory, from 1370 to 1495, and finally narrates the history of their decline under the stress of the religious wars and of the competition of more powerful rivals. The whole story is

brightly written, and the illustrations are sometimes good. Mr. Bain's book on **Christina, Queen of Sweden** (Allen), deals with a period that saw the downfall of the Hansa power, and with the life of "one of the most original and extraordinary women in her own or any age." Mr. Bain admits that he is an apologist for, or rather, perhaps, a vindicator of the brilliant but erratic Queen. He thinks that historians have been barely just, and endeavours to correct—often with force—the people who "go on abusing her, without knowing anything about her." It is on the whole an interesting and useful sketch of Christina's career as ruler, politician, traveller, genius, and eccentric, and it contains information of value on the history of Sweden and on the real character of the Queen. A less remarkable Queen has found a vindicator in Mr. John Cordy Jeaffreson, whose two volumes on **The Queen of Naples and Lord Nelson** (Hurst & Blackett) are mainly a supplement to the same writer's work on Lady Hamilton and Nelson. Mr. Jeaffreson has set to work to defend a woman who has been cruelly calumniated, and these two volumes go far to persuade the reader that Maria Carolina was on the whole a good and clever woman, a loving wife and mother, and a vigorous and energetic queen. For over twenty years she was ruler both of her husband and of his kingdom, and previously to 1790 she was a liberal-minded and popular sovereign. But the French Revolution converted her liberalism into terror, and her reforming measures into a policy of rigorous repression. Much of this book is devoted to the correspondence of the Queen with Lady Hamilton, and it is a correspondence which does credit to both; and much also is devoted to the refutation of the worst charges made against the character of the Queen, some of which, notably the charge of blood-thirstiness, Mr. Jeaffreson successfully refutes. Contemporaneous with this work in date, but distinct in the character of their subjects, are two books upon the French Revolution, one called **Reminiscences of a Regicide** (Chapman & Hall), by Mrs. Simpson, the other being **The Diary and Letters of Gouverneur Morris** (Kegan Paul), edited by Miss Morris. Mrs. Simpson's regicide is Sergeant Marceau, sometime a member of the Convention, and Administrator of Police during part of the French Revolution. The materials on which Mrs. Simpson has had to work include a memoir written by Sergeant in 1801, a later memoir dictated by him to Mrs. Davenport in 1846-7, and several other notes and papers relating to the most active period of his life. The memoirs are fragmentary and disjointed, and it is not always very easy to reconcile with one another Sergeant's various statements about himself and his contemporaries. But Mrs. Simpson has shown skill in weaving them together; the events they treat of are full of interest; and the commentary supplied by the editor is concise and useful. Sergeant lived to ninety-six, and Mrs. Simpson has some information worth reading to give about his later years. The "Diary of Gouverneur Morris" is, however, owing to its subject, of much greater interest. Morris was a member of the Constitutional Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, and subsequently one of the senators for New York in Congress. At one time he was entrusted with a secret mission to England, and his observations on George III. and his English visit have point and interest. At other periods of his life he visited other European capitals, Berlin and Vienna. But the chief interest of his official career lies in his residence in France during the course of the Revolution, and in the wise and discerning comments which from time to time he made on the events and personages of that wonderful drama. Morris reached Paris in the early part of year 1789, and during two years of his sojourn there—from 1792

to 1794—he filled the post of American Minister. From the first, his introductions gave him an opportunity of watching from within the progress of events. He gives a bright description of the meeting of the States-General. He has observations and information to offer on all the episodes of the years that followed—on the establishment of the new Constitution, on Mirabeau's hopes and schemes, on the consequences of the flight to Varennes, on the King's execution, and on the tragedies that followed. On all points his views and comments are full of interest and value, and distinguished by clear foresight and calm, penetrating reflection. His sketches of personages—such as the King, Talleyrand, and Madame de Stael—show the same ability and acuteness. But while the memoirs of Sergent and of Morris only recall episodes connected with one revolution, Mr. W. S. Lilly comes forward to sketch with the philosopher's pen the results of **A Century of Revolution** (Chapman & Hall). Mr. Lilly endeavours to sum up the results of "the ideas of 1789," and to examine the Revolution, after a century's experience of it, in its relation with liberty, science, art, democracy, and in its bearing on the public life of England. He states clearly and not unfairly the revolutionary dogma, and he appeals to Darwinism to shatter the theory of the natural rights of man. Mr. Lilly argues, as usual, with force and with success, and his work goes far to evidence the mischievous and mistaken nature of the doctrines which he condemns. Whether or not Mr. Lilly is equally successful in winning consent to the dogmas of Roman Catholicism, which he would fain substitute for those of the French Revolution, is a matter to be decided by individual taste alone.

Another and a more recondite chapter of history forms the subject of Mr. J. Shallow's book upon **The Templars' Trials** (Stevens). This book is "an attempt to estimate the evidence published, and to arrange documents in chronological order." Mr. Shallow states that there are yet further records as to the latter days of the Templars, which ought to be forthcoming from the libraries of Paris and the Vatican. Such records as we have he examines with care. And it is not the author's fault, but the insoluble uncertainty of the subject, which leaves us still unconvinced of either the guilt or the innocence of the Templars when we come to an end of the book. A very different body of warriors is treated of in Major-General Porter's **History of the Corps of Royal Engineers** (Longmans), which is at once a valuable and exhaustive book. The first of General Porter's volumes, and by far the more important of the two, deals with the history of the corps from its foundation, about the time of the Restoration, through the long War of the Spanish Succession, and onwards down to the battles of the Crimea, and the China War of 1857-1860. The author devotes a good deal of attention to the operations in Spain, which formed a part of the War of the Spanish Succession, but he treats in rather a scanty fashion the great sieges in the Low Countries which, as well as Marlborough's battles, made that war so memorable to us. In speaking of the campaign in the Crimea, General Porter can give the testimony of an eye-witness, and that certainly does not diminish the value of his work. The second volume of the history deals chiefly with the civilian exploits, and with the contemporaneous doings, of members of the corps. The small wars which it chronicles are not particularly inspiring; and for permanence and historical interest this volume is not equal to its companion. Another soldier, Colonel Fergusson, has edited a delightful book, which has little to do with military annals, but a good deal to do with a troublesome and warlike time. **Major Fraser's Manuscript** (Douglas) is the record of

a genuine Highland gentleman, "head of a considerable branch of the house of Lovat," in the lawless days that preceded the rebellion of 1715. Major James Fraser of Castle Leathers, who was in turn a rebel, an intriguer, a wanderer, and a loyal, semi-feudal retainer, owes much of the interest of his career to his close connection with Simon, the notorious Lord Lovat, whose friend, attendant, co-sufferer, and dupe he successively became. Highland politics in the beginning of the eighteenth century have a charm of their own about them, and Colonel Fergusson has turned that fact to good account. While writing of wars, we may mention here the four volumes in which Messrs. Johnson and Buel have chronicled the **Battles and Leaders of the Civil War** in America (Fisher Unwin). They do not profess to be a history, but rather to supply the necessary information to anyone who may be inclined to write one. The editors' plan has been to ask gentlemen who served on both sides in the war to write independent accounts of the chief actions and military operations which distinguished it, and thus to lay side by side distinct and able judgments of all the principal events. There are also given some sketches of personal adventure, and a good many useful diagrams and maps.

We have four books this year dealing with local history. Archdeacon O'Rorke has written two volumes on **The History of Sligo Town and County** (Duffy), in which, while sternly rebuking Irish historians for the "exaggeration" which is their "besetting sin," the author sweeps away most of the legends which render obscure and attractive the place of which he writes. Still, in spite of passages which stir the critic's bile, the Archdeacon has compiled a useful and exhaustive chronicle, and it is not his fault if the records of the O'Donnells and the O'Connors, the two great families of Sligo, are less enthralling than the idle reader loves. **A History of the Ancient Town and Manor of Basingstoke** (Simpkin & Marshall), which F. J. Baigent and J. E. Millard have prepared, is, unfortunately, bulky and dry. Basingstoke, the bugbear of the railway traveller in south-western parts, has a very interesting local history, dating from mediæval times, and the authors of this book have spared no care in examining this, and in setting forth antiquarian and historical information. The rolls of the Great Court of the Hundred of Basingstoke teem with valuable details, and the appendix of documents is also of great value. But one regrets that the total lack of arrangement mars the book. The same complaint applies with some force to Mr. Timmins' **History of Warwick**, in the series of **Popular County Histories** (Stock). Mr. Timmins divides his book into ten sections, dealing with history, legends, geology, biography, dialect, mansions, and several other things, respectively, and the result is that to some of the subjects he has not space to do justice. Surely the history of Kenilworth and Stratford, of Coventry and Warwick, of Shakespeare, Samuel Butler, George Eliot, David Cox, might be allowed to crowd out excerpts on physiography and folk lore, or, if it cannot be treated of adequately, had almost better be omitted altogether. Mrs. Boger's book upon the **Myths, Scenes, and Worthies of Somerset** (Redway) was intended only to be a "collection of myths and legends," but has "unwittingly" developed into history. The history, however, is not very serious; but the sketches of many famous figures, which this pleasant little volume contains—of Arthur and Alfred, both kings, or so reputed, of Dunstan and Ken, both bishops, of Pym and Monmouth, of Roger Bacon and Bracton, of Beau Nash and Provost Hawkins of Oriel, and of many other people quite as diverse—are not, we presume, intended to be

taken entirely as myths. Mrs. Bryant goes deeper in her brightly-written book on **Celtic Ireland** (Kegan Paul). Her style is vivid and clear, and her account of Ireland in all its aspects, artistic as well as social and political, in early days before the Norman Conquest, is concise and useful, although her sympathies perhaps induce her to plunge into too hasty condemnation of all the conquerors of the Celt. The book has a good index and three capital maps. Mr. Du Chaillu is far more ambitious in his attempt to explain another part of British history of at least an equally early date. **The Viking Age** (Murray) deals, in two volumes, with "the early history, manners, and customs of the ancestors of the English-speaking nations." As a theory of early English history, we fear that, in spite of the great labour and ingenuity of which it gives signs, Mr. Du Chaillu's book will not be accepted by the student or scholar; for he does not prove the theory which he advances, that in our origin we are Scandinavian, and practically not German at all. But everyone will readily admit the interest of the book, and the high value of the digest which it gives of all the information now extant regarding the ancient people of Scandinavia and the whole field of Scandinavian archaeology.

Three distinct popular series offer us accounts of popular heroes. The first in value are perhaps the two volumes on **Walpole** and on **Henry the Seventh**, which Mr. John Morley and Mr. James Gairdner have respectively contributed to Messrs. Macmillan's histories of **Twelve English Statesmen**. Mr. Morley has rarely written at a higher level. Passing very rapidly over Walpole's early years, he comes almost at once to his hero's parliamentary and political career. He gives us a fine sketch of Godolphin, and a sweeping condemnation of Bolingbroke, who, he believes, steadily planned a legitimist restoration, and emphasises with some force the importance of Dr. Sacheverell's sermon and its outcome. Of Walpole's ministerial career Mr. Morley treats with all his usual discrimination, inclining steadily to vindicate that statesman from the charges often brought against him. To foreign politics, however, we could wish that he had spared more space. On the question of Walpole's corruption, Mr. Morley argues boldly for an acquittal; the charge of personal peculation he disproves; the charge of parliamentary corruption he tries to disprove. Mr. Gairdner's book needs no higher praise than to be called, as it is, worthy of its companion volumes. Mr. Gairdner thoroughly knows his subject, and his picture of Henry, though in itself the portrait is not attractive, brings out clearly the ability of the King, his very remarkable financial powers, and the value and importance of his reign in the progress of the restoration of the country. The sketches of the two pretenders, Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, are graphic and full of interest. But at times we feel inclined to wish that Mr. Gairdner had dealt more with the constitutional history of the reign, and less with the personal aspect; which, however, considering the object of these volumes, he probably felt himself not at liberty to do. In the **English Men of Action** series, which the same publishers produce, we have a sketch of **Wellington** by Mr. George Hooper, which everyone will admit to be uncommonly well done. Mr. Hooper devotes almost three-quarters of his book to the Duke's military career, vindicating him against Lord Wolseley's criticisms, and gives one chapter only to the Duke as a politician, and one chapter to a very bright account of the Duke's concluding years. In the same series Sir W. Butler writes yet another, and perhaps the best, life of **Charles George Gordon**, with all the appreciativeness—though this is unfortunately marred by a good

deal of unnecessary political prejudice—of a soldier who was Gordon's companion-in-arms, and a member of the expedition sent out, too late, to save him. Professor Church deals with perhaps a greater soldier than either Wellington or Gordon in the person of **Henry the Fifth**, but we could wish he dealt with him a little less as a man of action, as a brilliant king and general, and rather more as a statesman and diplomatist as well. Lastly, Mr. H. D. Traill contributes a singularly unfortunate biography of **Lord Strafford**, a great man who has long stood in want of an adequate and fair biographer, but who cannot be said to have found one, except incidentally in Mr. Gardiner, yet. Two more of these biographical collections still require mention—Messrs. Allen's **Statesmen Series** and **Eminent Women Series**. To the latter, Mrs. C. Malden has contributed a sketch of **Jane Austen**—an uneventful life, which, as Mrs. Malden says, "affords but little material for a biographer to deal with." In the former, Mr. R. Dunlop writes upon **Grattan** in a timely and interesting little volume, which on the whole tries to be impartial, although it confesses to thinking the Union "a great political blunder." Colonel Malletson sketches the career of **Wellesley** in India and at home, and credits Lord Wellesley with having established "the predominance and consolidation of the British Empire in India." Captain Trotter does justice to another great Indian administrator in his volume upon **Lord Dalhousie**; while Miss Charlotte Yonge and Mr. T. E. Kebbel contribute respectively brief biographies of the **Prince Consort** and of the **Earl of Derby**. Miss Yonge takes as her basis Sir T. Martin's life of the Prince, but adds fresh information from the Duke of Coburg's memoirs and other sources. Mr. Kebbel writes appreciatively of the policy and career of a recent political leader, whom he considers to have been, whatever detractors may say, "a statesman of the first rank, a brilliant and courageous orator, and a liberal and high-minded gentleman." In connection with these biographies, we may mention the first of what is to be a new series on **The World's Great Explorers**, dealing with the **Life of John Davis, the Navigator, 1550–1605**. Mr. Clements Markham, who knows better than Davis ever knew them the seas which Davis sailed, is pre-eminently the right biographer for Davis; and he has done his work very thoroughly, extricating carefully the personal portions of Davis's life from the erring and inaccurate panegyrics of Mr. Froude and others, and recording with vivacity and knowledge Davis's exploits in the Malay Archipelago and elsewhere, and the three Arctic voyages which made his name historical.

But we have many other more substantial works to mention. Mr. Leslie Stephen's great **Dictionary of National Biography** (Smith & Elder) goes steadily forward, with its tale of volumes always up to time, treating of kings and statesmen, writers, villains, and divines—Mr. Fawcett and Fielding, Fairfax and Fulmer, and many others—with the same group of contributors, and with, generally speaking, the same satisfactory result. In three large volumes Mr. Bryce produces his important work on **The American Commonwealth** (Macmillan), which is almost a dictionary of democratic institutions. Mr. Bryce's aim has been to present "a general view of the United States, both as a government and as a nation." His five visits to America, his many friendships and intimacies there, and his general sympathy with the people about whom he writes, sympathy which perhaps at times inclines him to look steadily at the brightest aspects of his subject only, besides his own peculiar gifts and training, all contribute to fit Mr. Bryce for the post of commentator upon American institutions. These volumes are divided into

six parts, and deal successively with (1) The National Government; (2) The State Governments; (3) The Party System; (4) Public Opinion; (5) Illustrations and Reflections; (6) Social Institutions. Of these six parts, the earlier ones are perhaps the more lucid and valuable, specially the account of the President, Congress, and the courts of law, and the section dealing with the State Governments. Mr. Bryce has a breadth of view and thoroughness of knowledge, as well as a fine taste for passages readable, brilliant and eloquent, which make his volumes generally delightful to read. In parts, perhaps, at the end, one feels that he is going on too long, and that the last few chapters, which are more sketchy than the rest, are not an essential part of the book. But, on the whole, it is a great work, full of practical usefulness, of sympathetic appreciativeness, of political wisdom, of information, and of charm. Another eminent and philosophical observer, as learned as Mr. Bryce, has left behind him a book upon **International Law** (Murray). Sir Henry Maine delivered the lectures which are here published before the University of Cambridge in Michaelmas Term, 1887. Mr. Frederic Harrison and Sir Frederick Pollock have, since their author's death, passed them through the press. The lectures deal with twelve separate subjects, among which are "International Law, its Origin, Sources, Authority, and Sanction;" "State Sovereignty;" the "Mitigation of War;" the "Modern Laws of War;" "Relations of Belligerents on Land;" "Proposals to Abate War;" the "Declaration of Paris;" and other topics. All display the grasp and interest which belong to anything that Sir Henry Maine wrote. Another book on a subject not entirely distinct from these is Mr. David Nicol's work on **The Political Life of Our Time** (Chapman & Hall). Unfortunately its author does not always display the information or lucidity of judgment which is characteristic of Mr. Bryce and of Sir H. Maine. In his first volume Mr. Nicol discusses historically the origins of our political culture, in China, in India, in Rome, and in modern Europe. In his second he deals comprehensively, and sometimes with force and with success, with the many difficult questions arising out of that political culture to-day—with Conservatism and Democracy, capital and labour, trades unions, the land question, and many other points and problems.

Turning to another branch of literature, there is not to be found among the biographies of the year any, perhaps, of quite the highest degree of interest. Among those, however, that are most important, and that ought to be, owing to their subject, most interesting, is Mr. Spencer Walpole's **Life of Lord John Russell** (Longmans). Mr. Walpole has had to tell the story of a life singularly long-connected with the history of the nineteenth century. He tells it with accuracy and fairness, but fails somehow to impart to it the interest which it ought to have. Mr. Walpole has endeavoured to keep strictly to the personal side of the subject, and tells us much of Lord Russell's private life, his relations, his home, and his least-known writings. But with regard to the history of the times, which, after all, is the chief interest connected with, and consequently inseparable from, the life of a statesman, Mr. Walpole assumes too intimate a knowledge in his readers, and sometimes leaves historic episodes unfinished and his account of particular incidents incomplete. The book wants much more history in it. Mr. Walpole begins with an account of Lord John's early years, and goes on to tell the story of the Reform Bill, and the rapidly rising reputation of his hero in the years that immediately followed. This is the most interesting, as well as the most satisfactory, part of Lord John's life, and the end of the first volume leaves

him as Prime Minister at the zenith of his career. The story which follows, of the gradual break-up of the Whig ministry, of the ministerial vicissitudes, of Lord John's acceptance of subordinate office, of his dissatisfaction and decline in popularity, of the rivalry between him and Lord Palmerston, of Palmerston's triumph, of Lord Russell's vigorous and brilliant action in regard to Italian affairs, and of his singularly unfortunate management of the Danish question, is less interesting and less to the glory of Lord John. Of the still later days of Lord Russell's second Premiership Mr. Walpole, perhaps wisely, says little; and a closing chapter and epilogue end the book. It is a remarkable career, that of the man who, after riding in Wellington's train over some of the battlefields of the Peninsula, lived to join, after being twice Prime Minister of England, in the agitation against the Bulgarian atrocities; and, if we do not agree with Mr. Walpole's treatment of it, it is at any rate a subject which cannot fail to interest all. By the side of Lord John's life we must place Mr. Lloyd Sandars's collection of **Lord Melbourne's Papers** (Longmans), to which Lord Cowper has written a prefatory notice, which has the sole, but serious, fault of being much too short. Mr. Sandars has arranged the letters clearly, and interposed short explanatory notes, which might well, like the preface, have been enlarged. The letters themselves, often brightly written, deal, a few only with personal, the great majority with political topics; but some of them are so political as to read like official despatches, and none of them have any very remarkable charm. They make one wish to have more of a personal sketch of the minister as he was. Among the political letters, those to King William and the King's replies are decidedly the best reading. Another and a very different type of minister is the subject of Mr. Barry O'Brien's book on **Thomas Drummond** (Kegan Paul). Drummond was born in 1797, entered the army in 1815, obtained a post on the Ordnance Survey in Ireland, met Lord Brougham, and was by him introduced to political and official life. In 1833 he was appointed Lord Althorp's private secretary, "at the united wish of the Cabinet;" in 1835 he received his nomination to the post of Under Secretary in Ireland, which has brought him his fame. As might be expected, Drummond's biography is mainly concerned with official matters, but Mr. Barry O'Brien has a great deal also to say about the condition and politics of Ireland—some people may think, too much.

There ought to be a good deal of biographical interest in Dr. Birkbeck Hill's collection of the **Letters of David Hume to William Strahan** (Clarendon Press); but there is not really much. Hume was not a brilliant letter-writer, and his letters to his publisher, celebrity as that publisher was, are not particularly remarkable, although one learns from them that Hume had less difficulty in finding a publisher than many other distinguished men. Dr. Hill's notes are full of matter and of learning, and form the most important part of the book. **The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley** (Murray) is a much more entertaining book. If Motley was a less distinguished historian than Hume—though it is curious to notice that Hume's history was one of the first books he read as a boy—he wrote far better letters. The account of his travels, of his diplomatic career, of the personages he met, specially of the Czar Nicholas and of his friend Bismarck, and his observations on English society and of the familiar figures moving in it in his day, are full of interest. Motley had difficulty in getting his history published, but its success introduced him at once to men like Macaulay, Thackeray, Palmerston, and Russell, and all the distinguished people of the day, with regard to whom his letters have a good deal to tell. Mr. Clayden treats of another figure

notable in the society of Motley's day, as he had also been notable in the society of Pitt's. **Rogers and his Contemporaries** (Smith & Elder) is a continuation and completion of the two volumes which Mr. Clayden has already dedicated to Rogers's early life. These volumes cover the period from 1808 to 1855, and, beginning with tales of Wyndham and Byron, and with the death of Fox, carry us down to the days of the Great Exhibition, and past the death of Sir Robert Peel. All through this long period Rogers lived in the centre of London life, entertaining hospitably all the great men who have made the century famous, and Mr. Clayden has much to tell of them that is interesting, and some things which are new. While mentioning the literary celebrities of the century, we ought to record the addition of yet two more books to the mass of biographical literature on the subject of the Carlyles. Mr. Norton publishes two volumes of **Letters of Thomas Carlyle, 1826-1836** (Macmillan), and Mr. D. G. Ritchie brings out one volume of **Early Letters of Jane Welsh Carlyle** (Sonnenschein). Mr. Norton offers us a hundred and fifty-eight letters, many of which—most of which in fact—deal with domestic and trivial matters, but which also contain a good many vigorous and pointed passages about Coleridge and Brougham, Leigh Hunt, Miss Austen, Southey, Wordsworth, and others, and which incidentally illustrate in a very strong light Carlyle's deep feeling of admiration for John Stuart Mill. Mr. Ritchie's book is very well edited, and the forty-three letters by Mrs. Carlyle which it gives us, and most of which are written to Miss Eliza Stoddart, the cousin and intimate friend of Miss Jane Welsh, are new and excellent reading. Miss Welsh's love-passages and early sentiments with regard to the man whom she was destined to marry are referred to with a great deal of humour. The book contains twelve letters by Carlyle, which are not of much importance. Neither Mr. Norton nor Mr. Ritchie gives us cause for complaint, only—only—when will these outpourings about the unfortunate Carlyle household cease?

There are several books which have been written this year on the lives of Indian heroes. Major W. Broadfoot has written, chiefly from information supplied by the diary of the officer whose career is the subject of his story, a narrative of **The Career of Major George Broadfoot, C.B., in Afghanistan and the Punjab** (Murray). The period dealt with in the narrative covers only a few years, the last few years of Broadfoot's life, and begins in 1841, to end in 1845. But it was well worth while to do justice to the memory of a brave officer who in the gloomy and disastrous days of the first Afghan war did so much to maintain the credit of the British troops, who, with one or two others, was mainly instrumental in preventing the surrender of Jelalabad in 1842, and who died, at the age of thirty-eight, cheering his men on to the attack at the battle of Ferozshah. The book has an index, and maps of Jelalabad and the Sulej. Mr. T. Holmes has written a book on **Four Famous Soldiers** (Allen), whose names are bound up with Indian history. Of Sir Charles and Sir William Napier and of Sir Herbert Edwardes Mr. Holmes writes with fairness and appreciation, sketching their careers, and pointing out the brilliancy of their exploits; but of the fourth officer whom he has chosen as a subject, "Hodson of Hodson's Horse," he gives us an unsparing condemnation. Mr. Holmes's accusations are often very heavy, and we could wish he had permitted to slumber the controversies and charges connected with that officer's name. Another Indian topic is dealt with in Lady Login's book upon **Sir John Login and Duleep Singh** (Allen). Lady Login's object has been to tell the story of

"the first connection of the Maharajah with the British." She thinks it fair to show that there is something to be said upon the Maharajah's side; and the fact that Sir John Login knew the Maharajah intimately, that he was for many years his guardian, and that it was in Sir John's house that the Maharajah adopted Christianity, has naturally given Lady Login exceptional opportunities of knowledge on the subject. Colonel Malleon writes a short introduction, and in that introduction he calls attention specially to the fifteenth—and the concluding—chapter of Lady Login's book, as helping to explain to a great degree the unfortunate events connected with the latter part of Duleep Singh's career. Two very different types of memoirs are offered by the next two books before us, Mr. Graves's **Life of Sir William Rowan Hamilton, Royal Astronomer of Ireland** (Hodges, Figgis & Co., and Longmans), and Mr. Serjeant Robinson's **Bench and Bar** (Hurst & Blackett). Each book treats of the life of a specialist, and of a successful specialist. Sir W. R. Hamilton was a distinguished mathematician, and also, though the combination must be rare, a poet, a metaphysician, and a linguist. He was born in 1805; at twenty-one, while still an undergraduate, he was elected Professor of Astronomy in Dublin and Royal Astronomer of Ireland. In 1835 he was knighted. In 1837 he became President of the Irish Royal Society. In 1843 he made his greatest discovery, and invented his Calculus of Quaternions. In 1865 he died. Mr. Graves is no specialist, but he writes a sympathetic biography, of which Hamilton's correspondence with Wordsworth, Herschel, Coleridge, and others is not the least interesting part. Mr. Serjeant Robinson's book is so utterly unlike Mr. Graves's that we owe both an apology for mentioning them together. It is a book full of legal reminiscences, full of tales, of anecdotes, and of amusing recollections. Maule and Ballantine, Sir John Karslake and Lord Westbury, and many other legal personages, are put under contribution, and the contributions from them or concerning them are always entertaining and gay. Everyone will read with amusement these "reminiscences of one of the last of an ancient race." A great poet, who figures largely in the biographies of nearly all the famous people of the nineteenth century, has this year himself found a biographer. Dr. Knight has produced three volumes upon **The Life of William Wordsworth** (Paterson), which, he tells us, are "intentionally a storehouse of facts, and not a critical memoir." These volumes contain a great deal of material hitherto unpublished, and, although bulky, and containing much information that is not always strictly personal to the poet, they constitute a useful and a valuable life. Of course Dr. Knight has practically to write the life of Coleridge and of Dorothy Wordsworth too; but that does not detract from the interest. Of the housekeeping of William and Dorothy, of Dorothy's Grasmere journal, of the poet's married life, of the most unromantic courtship and honeymoon which prefaced it, and of the long and famous years that followed, Dr. Knight writes always sympathetically, with care, with patience, and with detail. The same writer has edited this year a selection from the papers of the Wordsworth Society, which ought to be mentioned here. **Wordsworthiana** (Macmillan) represents the fruit of seven years' labour performed by the Wordsworth Society, a society which seems to have been endowed with more discretion, and which has consequently been less exposed to the cavilling of scoffers, than some other bodies with analogous titles and presumably analogous aims. It contains papers read to the society at different times by such men as Mr. Lowell, Mr. Hutton, Mr. Stopford Brooke, Mr. Spence Watson, and others, notable

among which are the papers "On the earlier and later styles of Wordsworth," which Mr. Hutton contributes, and on the 'Reminiscences of Wordsworth among the Westmoreland peasantry.' Mr. H. S. Salt writes effectively the biography of another poet—**The Life of James Thomson ("B. V."), with a Selection from his Letters and a Study of his Writings** (Reeves & Turner). But there is little in Thomson's life to tell. Some of the letters, notably those that passed between George Eliot and Thomson, are interesting; but the details of the poet's life are generally of slight interest, except when one comes to read of his suffering and depression, of his perpetual sleeplessness, and of the way in which he wandered at night through the dark and silent thoroughfares of the City of Dreadful Night; and those details are sad. Mrs. Julian Marshall also writes the biography, not of a poet, but of a poet's wife, in **The Life and Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley** (Bentley), which is authorised by the representatives of the poet's family, a fact which perhaps ought to be remembered in reading the book. Mrs. Marshall is, of course, obliged to cover much of the ground over which Professor Dowden has travelled, and in her first volume, which ends with Shelley's death, she has recourse, in order to illustrate the career of Mary Shelley, to many of the documents which Professor Dowden uses to illustrate the poet's life. Mrs. Marshall in her first volume gives an account of Mary Shelley's family and early life, of her connection with Clare Clairmont, which was not always a source of comfort, of Shelley's separation from Harriet—a separation which Mrs. Marshall believes to have been justified, and which she is not inclined to condemn—and of the union and married life which followed this. The second volume, which deals with Mary Shelley's widowhood, contains more new matter, and Mrs. Shelley's life during this period is told now for the first time. Of her heroine's return to England, her home at Putney and at Harrow, and of the boyhood, youth, and finally the happy marriage of the poet's son, Mrs. Marshall tells the story, so far as it is a pleasant one, pleasantly enough. Another lady's life is recorded in the two volumes which Miss Howitt has edited, under the title of **Mary Howitt: an Autobiography** (Isbister). The narrative which it contains is clearly told, and not without interest. Of the simple Quaker life of the authoress, of her marriage, of her literary labours, of her husband's charm and fame, of the society they both mixed with, and of the steady work which they both did, these two volumes give a record that is unaffected and often entertaining, even if it be a little long. Eminent women and their lives and writings multiply rapidly every year. We have two memoirs of women before us, both of which have some bearing upon well-known periods. One is Mrs. R. K. Van Alstune's sketch of **Charlotte Corday** (Allen). The other is Mr. J. B. Seeley's account of **Fanny Burney** (Seeley). Mrs. Alstune's object has been "to present to the reader as complete a life of Charlotte Corday as possible, and one containing only well-authenticated facts." Many of the writer's historical statements are based on papers relating to the Revolution, collected by M. Charles Vatel. The subject is an interesting one, but we do not think the book's historical value very great. The life of Fanny Burney is already tolerably well known, and we cannot imagine why anybody should want to read more about it. Still, for those who do, Mr. Seeley's book is a bright and pleasantly written one, with illustrations which are nice to look at. Of course the select passages from her diary and writings which it contains are often amusing; and her friends, of whom a good deal is told, are unquestionably celebrated and

august. Everyone knows so well who they were, that one need not particularise further. Another literary life, of more interest and importance, will be found in the two volumes which Mr. Aitken has devoted to **The Life of Richard Steele** (Isbister). Mr. Aitken has spared no pains to procure information, and has discoveries to make known with regard to Steele's first wife and second marriage. He deals with Steele successively as soldier, playwright, politician, and pamphleteer, and he takes all through these volumes an estimate of Steele's character which many of us may think too high. The career of the attractive, if unstable, personage with whom he is concerned makes Mr. Aitken's book thoroughly interesting, and his impartiality, his knowledge of the times, his skill in arrangement, and his vigour in narration make his work as valuable as it is interesting.

Rising to a loftier level, we find before us the memoirs of a bishop. The **Memoirs of Francis Thomas McDougall, D.C.L., F.R.C.S., sometime Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak, and of Harriette, his Wife** (Longmans), contain the biography of a very able and genial divine, who, beginning life in a marching regiment, became successively a midshipman, a mechanic, a doctor of medicine, a missionary, and a bishop. The interest of the book centres in the account which it gives of Rajah Brooke's wonderful little kingdom of Sarawak, of the Rajah's court and the Bishop's labours there, of the schools and libraries which grew up under the two men, of their discussions and controversies and co-operation, of the sensational experiences which sometimes befell them both, and of the Bishop's long administration, assisted and counselled by his wife. After twenty years' work in Sarawak, Dr. McDougall was able to come home, and to help in the clerical work of the diocese of Winchester for some time before his death. A different, and to most, perhaps, a far more interesting figure in the English Church was the man whose history his son tells in a book entitled **William George Ward and the Oxford Movement** (Macmillan). W. G. Ward—"Ideal Ward," as he was called—was not only one of the most remarkable men and college tutors in the Oxford of his time, and not only, as the Dean of Durham calls him, "the last of the great conversationalists;" he was also one of the chief leaders of the Tractarian movement, and one of the most intellectually logical and historically illogical of the men who carried that movement into its later phases, and helped to carry some of its conspicuous disciples into the Church of Rome. The story of Ward's life, from the day when, in 1830, he came up from Winchester to Oxford, his attachment to Arnold and to Newman, his friendship with Lake, with Stanley, with Clough, with Oakeley, with Froude, his intensely vivid personality, the opinions formed of him by men like Mr. Jowett and Dean Church and others, many of which are quoted here, and his final conversion to the Romish Church, at which point the story ends, are all brought out with vividness and taste. From men who moulded their religion on a study of the lives of the early Fathers, we may pass to the **Lives of the Fathers** themselves (Black). Even the intrepid Archdeacon of Westminster has not attempted to write "a full and continuous history of the early Church," but is satisfied with trying, in two volumes of compendious bulk, to connect "the history of the Church during the first four centuries with the lives of her principal Fathers and teachers." The first volume begins with "St. Ignatius of Antioch, Bishop and Martyr," and goes on to treat of Polycarp and Cyprian, Origen and Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers and Gregory of Nazianzus. Of these, Athanasius has the lion's share of space. In the second volume the Archdeacon gives most space to "St. Augustine" and

"St. Jerome," and ends with an often brilliant sketch of Chrysostom. Both volumes are, of course, vividly written and eminently readable, and convince us that Dr. Farrar ought to be made a bishop, of a busy diocese, at once. While speaking of the history of the Church, we should mention Dr. Jessopp's book, **The Coming of the Friars, and other Historic Essays** (Fisher Unwin), which is, however, when compared with the "Lives of the Fathers," sadly secular in tone. The paper on "The Friars" is not the most interesting, though nothing Dr. Jessopp writes can help being interesting. The paper on "Village Life Six Hundred Years Ago" describes the social condition of a country district in the time of Edward I., and that and the essay on "Daily Life in a Mediæval Monastery" seem to us, perhaps, the best. There are also, among other pleasant papers, two valuable essays on "The Black Death in East Anglia," and one on "Lodowick, the Founder of the Muggletonians," which most people will find good to read. Besides these books, which have something to do with theological topics, there are three books on more strictly theological points to be noticed, first of which is **A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays**, by the author of "Supernatural Religion" (Longmans). Dr. Lightfoot republished the essays which had formed his contribution to the controversy, and this republication provoked the author of "Supernatural Religion" to reply. This he does in eight essays or chapters dealing with various points, such as "The Ignatian Epistles," "Papias of Hierapolis," "The Churches of Gaul," "Tatian's 'Diatessaron,'" and others, and making, it must be admitted, an effective answer to the somewhat severe charges of the Bishop. Canon H. M. Luckock has written a book called **The Divine Liturgy** (Rivingtons), the object of which is to set forth, in the shape of a series of "instructions," the order for Holy Communion, historically, doctrinally, and devotionally. The book is divided into fifty short chapters, each dealing with one topic—"The Altar," "The Epistle," "The Nicene Creed," "The Absolution," "The Sign of the Cross," and similar headings. The same publishers produce a second series of **Oxford House Papers**, written for working-men by members of the University of Oxford, to which Dean Church, Mr. A. T. Lyttelton, Mr. Gore, Mr. J. G. Adderley, and others have contributed, and which discuss ably matters of practical Christianity, while grouping them under such headings as "The Christian Church," "The Necessity of Pain," and "Evolution and Christianity."

Science in these days stands next to religion, and in science, or rather in scientific philosophy, we have this year one remarkable book. In **Moral Order and Progress: an Analysis of Ethical Conceptions** (Trubner) Mr. S. Alexander endeavours to group together and to systematise various ethical conceptions, with a view to enabling us to trace the origin and to decide on the value of different moral theories. In his first book Mr. Alexander examines and analyses will and desire, conduct and character. He finds time to praise Mr. Stephen, to discuss Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mill, and to attack Mr. Green. In his second book Mr. Alexander inquires into obligation, the moral sense, the moral end, its elements and its relation to pleasure. In Book III. he treats of the progressive movement of the moral ideal. Mr. Alexander's treatise is always scholarly and thoughtful, and very often profound. A different branch of science is treated in **The Primitive Family in its Origin and Development** (Kegan Paul). This volume, which Mr. Starcke, of Copenhagen, publishes in the International Scientific Series, investigates the social relations of primitive communities, drawing its illustrations from various tribes in Africa, Australia, America, and elsewhere,

and accepts no current theory absolutely, but criticises and clearly analyses all. Dr. St. George Mivart is more ambitious in his book **On Truth, a Systematic Inquiry** (Kegan Paul). He covers a very large field of inquiry—physics, chemistry, physiology, and metaphysics. He discusses various conceptions of truth and the failure of various attempts to attain it, and endeavours to establish the interdependence between philosophy and science. But it is not altogether easy to master his aim. Two more purely and popularly scientific books are Dr. Lodge's **Modern Views of Electricity** (Macmillan), and General Babbage's volume on **Babbage's Calculating Engines** (Spon). The former aims at setting forth in a form which most people can understand the results of modern attempts to explain the phenomena of electricity, magnetism, and light, by known principles of mechanics and hydrodynamics, and incidentally it discusses the possibility of directly manufacturing light. In the latter General Babbage collects for the first time all the information that is forthcoming with regard to the history and construction of the wonderful calculating machines on which Mr. Babbage spent so much time, ingenuity, and money, and which repaid him with so much fame.

There are a few books of a very high order in the literary criticism of the year. A second series of **Essays in Criticism** (Macmillan) is published after its great author's death. In these essays Mr. Arnold returns to his habit of depreciation of Shelley, whose flights he could or would never measure, and has something frank and severely cultured to say about the faults of Shakespeare. But, as a recompense, he gives us, in the address on Milton, delivered at St. Margaret's Church, a fine panegyric, and he writes in the same strain of eulogy, and with all his skill and subtlety, on Amiel, Gray, and Keats. We have another series of essays, too, from a departed Oxford figure in the two substantial volumes in which Mr. H. Nettleship edits the **Essays by the late Mark Pattison** (Clarendon Press). The essays treat of various subjects, for Mark Pattison's learning was deep and varied. They begin with a theory of history written in 1845, and suggested by Gregory of Tours, and end with a counter theory, written in 1857, and suggested by Buckle's "History of Civilisation." There is a paper on "Theology in Germany," another on "Learning in the Church of England;" one on Muræus, one on F. A. Wolf, one on Bishop Warburton. There are some articles on the theology and literature of the eighteenth century, in which Mr. Pattison shows his preference for Pope; and there are many others also. All are marked by vigour and force, some by rare excellence. Mr. Gosse contributes to literary criticism **A History of Eighteenth Century Literature** (Macmillan). He divides the literature of the one hundred and twenty years which succeeded the Restoration (1660-1780) into three equal periods, each of which, he maintains, "is dominated by one figure of far greater intellectual prestige than any other of the same period. No one will question that the first of these is the generation of Dryden, nor the last that of Johnson. It may not, perhaps, be quite so readily conceded that the age of Anne lay under the tyranny of Swift." But after discussing the claims of Pope and Addison, Mr. Gosse decides, in this period, for Swift. Mr. Gosse begins with an account of the poets, the dramatists, and the prose writers of the Restoration, and in his chapter on the Restoration dramatists is singularly happy. So, too, is he when he passes on to the essayists and writers of Anne's time. With Swift and Defoe, also, Mr. Gosse deals in a masterly way. To Bolingbroke he is, however, strangely unfair; but he recovers his appreciative

judgment when he reaches Goldsmith and Johnson. All through it is a most agreeable book, and it often rises to a high degree of literary merit. But none of these essayists, not even Mr. Arnold, can rival Mr. Pater in one respect. In **Appreciations: with an Essay on Style** (Macmillan) Mr. Pater exhibits again that exquisite touch and transparency of workmanship, as well as the deep appreciative sympathy, which make his literary criticism so often reach perfection. On Wordsworth, on Charles Lamb, "the student of literature as a fine art," on Shakespeare, on Sir Thomas Browne, and on more general questions, such as the discussion of what is classical and what romantic in literature, Mr. Pater displays the feeling and the intuitive taste which are characteristic of everything he writes. In the essay on "Style" he stands upon ground which very few can dispute with him, and he speaks practically, and gives much sound advice.

Mr. Pater's writing takes us naturally to art and poetry. In the field of art there is not very much to mention, except a book on **The Architecture of Provence and the Riviera** (Douglas), and **A History of Miniature Art, with Notes on Collectors and Collections** (Macmillan). Mr. David Macgibbon writes on the architecture of the South of France. He begins with a map of the country, and three short introductory chapters, which are chiefly historical. Then he discusses the remains of classical architecture in the district; and from that he proceeds to treat, at much greater length, of the remains of mediæval architecture to be found there. The book is provided with useful sketches and plans. Mr. J. L. Probert's history of "Miniature Art" is a handsome quarto book, and rich in charming illustrations. Mr. Probert discusses the origin and early days of miniature painting, from Holbein onwards, through Hudson and Richardson and Jervas, down to the great days of Flatman, Dixon, Loggan, of Gibson and of Samuel Cooper, who painted miniatures of half the heroes of the Commonwealth. There are some bright chapters in the book on "Collectors and Collections," and if the whole book is not equal, at any rate parts of it are very good. But the poets this year have given us more than the historians of art. Once again Lord Tennyson, and at his side Mr. Browning, offer us new volumes of poems. It is almost enough to say that the little volume called **Demeter, and other Poems** (Macmillan) is worthy of the Laureate. The poem which gives its title to the book, and which tells again the old story of Demeter and Persephone, is written in that fine classical verse of which Lord Tennyson is as much a master as he is of almost every other style. Prefixed to this poem are a few verses of beautiful pathos, addressed to Lord Dufferin, acknowledging the Viceroy's friendship for the poet's dead son. Another poem is addressed to an old friend, Miss Boyle. Another, "The Ring," is a story of romantic incident. Others offer specimens of all the poet's familiar styles, including an example of the Lincolnshire dialect, named "Ond Roa." Others, like "Merlin and the Gleam" and the wonderful poem called "Happy," show the same sweetness as of old. But the masterpiece is the little poem, of four stanzas, called "Crossing the Bar," with which the volume ends:—

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea,

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
• Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
 And after that the dark !
 And may there be no sadness of farewell
 When I embark ;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
 The flood may bear me far,
 I hope to see my Pilot face to face
 When I have crost the bar.

Mr. Browning's little volume, *Asolando* (Smith & Elder), is equally characteristic of the great poet, whose last words it contains. Here, too, there is the same variety of style and metre, from the poem on "The Cardinal and the Dog," and the beautiful little piece called "Inapprehensiveness," to the "Bad Dreams," and the longer pieces, "Beatrice Signorini" and "Rephan." We note also charming little lyrics, like "Rosny," and the two stanzas called "A Pearl, a Girl," among other things more serious and difficult, like the "Reverie," and "Epilogue"; but all alike are full of the power and sweetness, the quick flashes of thought and humour and rhyme, which set Mr. Browning beside Lord Tennyson. And next to, and scarcely below, these two volumes, comes a third from another great poet, a third series of **Poems and Ballads** (Chatto & Windus), in no way unworthy of Mr. Swinburne's fame. In this series there is perhaps less brilliancy than in its predecessors, but there is a certain tone of quiet, maturer beauty, which its predecessors lacked. The masterpiece of this volume is the ode on the Spanish Armada, where all the poet's splendour of imagery, and swinging, stirring rhyme combine with his love of the sea and the winds, and his mastery of their moods and beauties, to produce a magnificent lyrical song. In the same patriotic temper, but in a totally different metre, is "The Commonweal," suggested by the Jubilee celebration. "March; an Ode," is a poem in octometers, and remarkable as a *tour de force*; "Olive" and "To a Seamew" are two delightful lyrics. And another notable feature of the book, perhaps to some the most notable, is the collection of dramatic ballads in the dialect of the Border country. But more charming, on the whole, than these songs of the Debatable Land are the Jacobite ballads, written also in dialect, of which one specially, called "A Jacobite's Farewell," may be taken as a good representative. Besides these three fine volumes of poetry, the year has produced several little books of verse—one of **Poems and Translations**, by W. J. Linton (Nimmo), which are very cheerful and attractive; another, of **Lyrics and Ballads** (Bentley), by Mrs. Woods, which is full of delicate, tasteful verse, and sometimes of ringing, strenuous conviction; another, entitled **The Ascent of Man: and other Poems** (Chatto & Windus), in which Miss Mathilde Blind embodies in verse the theories of Darwin and Darwinians, and does not always touch a high level; another, called **Love's Widowhood, and other Poems** (Macmillan), where Mr. Alfred Austin displays again his gift of writing poetry which, in spite of some defects, is generally musical and refined; and, lastly, a collection of sonnets and of other pieces, with the touching name **In Vinculis** (Kegan Paul), in which it is pleasant to think that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt can have found consolation for the barbarities of an Irish gaol, and which abound in allusions, in no way disguised, to current political controversies and to the lamentable episode of Mr. Blunt's incarceration.

There are still some books to chronicle which deal with travel and sport. On the subject of sport to be obtained at home there are two more excellent

volumes in **The Badminton Library** (Longmans), one upon **Driving**, a great part of which is written by the Duke of Beaufort, assisted by Lord Algernon St. Maur, General Teesdale, Lady Georgiana Curzon—on tandem driving—and some others; and the other upon **Fencing, Boxing, and Wrestling**, in which Mr. E. B. Michell undertakes to deal with "Boxing," Mr. W. Armstrong with "Wrestling," while Mr. Walter Pollock and others lay down the rules for, and tell the history of, "Fencing." There is also a little volume, called **Woodland, Moor, and Stream** (Smith & Elder), which has only very indirectly to do with sport, which Mr. J. A. Owen introduces with a short preface, and which contains the notes of a naturalist, "a skilled workman," whose work has led him into Surrey and Kent, and "who has made the study of wild creatures in their native haunts the passion of his life and the exclusive occupation of his leisure hours." On the subject of sport to be obtained abroad there is more to be found in Mr. W. H. Seton-Karr's **Ten Years' Wild Sports in Foreign Lands** (Chapman & Hall). Mr. Seton-Karr takes his readers to a great variety of countries, to Norway, to Canada, to Alaska, to Persia, to India, and the whole volume is full of exciting adventure and of hair-breadth escapes. It is only fair to add that it is also full of genuine interest, and that all the episodes related, from the wolf-hunts in Swedish Lapland to the mountaineering in Alaska, are picturesquely told. Of the Dark Continent we have, as usual, travellers' records. Mr. J. R. Werner gives an account of **A Visit to Stanley's Rear-Guard, with an account of River-Life on the Congo** (Blackwood), in which, while he has not much to tell about the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, he has a great deal of information to offer as to the condition of the Congo Free State. Mr. Werner takes rather a gloomy view of Tippoo-Tib, and generally of the official maladministration on the Congo; and his account of the universal slavery and slave-hunts, of the occasional instances of cannibalism, and of many curious native customs, is well worth reading. Mr. Werner paid two visits to Major Barttelot's camp on the Aruwahmi, and his references to that officer are frequent. Mr. R. P. Ashe writes of another district which Stanley has helped to make known to us, in his book upon **Two Kings of Uganda** (Sampson Low). The two kings spoken of are Mtesa and Mwanga, and the tale of their reigns and of the disasters which followed is one of unusual interest. Mr. Ashe, of course, takes great interest in the fortunes of Christianity in that district, and his book is an account of the struggle of the Christian missions, first against the heathenism of the tribes of Uganda, and then against the Mohammedanism of the Arabs. Hitherto, it would seem, the power of Christendom has waned in those regions. Coming nearer home, Mr. Mallock writes a narrative of a "winter's retreat" **In an Enchanted Island** (Bentley). Cyprus is the land of his enchantment, whither Mr. Mallock went in search of green marble, but where he found endless charm of custom, of climate, of colour, of hospitality, and of architecture, undisturbed by modern Radicalism, and rendered pleasant to him by the evident appreciativeness which they all inspired. **The Land of Manfred** is another slight but pleasant sketch-book of travels "in remote parts of Southern Italy" (Murray). Mrs. Ross, its authoress, is not always strong in her historical narratives or in her descriptions of architecture; but she writes of a country little known even to makers of guide-books, and the subject is in itself full of charm. Two other books still remain to be recorded to complete our list, of which the more popular, perhaps, though not the more valuable, may be Lady Brassey's account of **The Last Voyage, to India and Australia, in the "Sunbeam"** (Longmans).

Wherever the famous yacht went she was received with hospitality and welcome, almost with triumph. Governors, princes, mayors and officers came out to meet and greet her and her owners, and in all parts of the world which they visited—in India, in Borneo, in Australia, and in the tropical seas of Malay—Lord and Lady Brassey had the best opportunities of learning and seeing whatever was to be learned or seen. Lord Brassey contributes a short narrative of the last part of the voyage, from Darnley Island home, and Lady Broome edits Lady Brassey's work. Last, but by no means least, of the books of the year, and remarkable in interest as well as in incidental political value, is the handsome volume on **Russia in Central Asia** (Longmans), written by Mr. George Curzon, who comes as near as anybody can come in these democratic days to being the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories. The nucleus of the book appeared in a series of articles contributed by Mr. Curzon to various newspapers in the winter of 1888-9, describing the writer's journeys in Central Asia. Mr. Curzon visited most parts of the country, Merv and the Oxus, "Bokhara the Noble," Samarkand and Tashkent, and has a great deal to say in the way of description and anecdote. But the importance of his book he would, perhaps, attribute to the latter chapters, which discuss the political question and the probable results of the rapid extension and development of Russia in Central Asia. The illustrations are good and frequent, whilst the information gleaned upon points over which a profound darkness and mystery have long hovered, will serve as the text for politicians in many inevitable discussions upon our relations with the other Great Power which shares with us a preponderating influence in Asia.

ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

ART.

The National Gallery.—A change in the system by which the money voted for the purchase of pictures was in future to be applied marked a fresh departure in the attitude of the State to Art. This change, to outward appearance very trifling, may prove of great importance when more than usually valuable pictures are unexpectedly offered for purchase. Hitherto the National Gallery and other museums have been called upon to surrender at the close of each financial year so much of their respective grants as remained unexpended. In future, any sum provided by Parliament for the purchase of pictures may, if not expended in the year of its issue, be held over and be used to supplement the grant of the succeeding year. Moreover, the Treasury consented to reconsider its decision of suspending indefinitely its annual grant for the purchase of pictures, and having inserted 2,000*l.* in the estimates 1888-9, reverted in the estimates 1889-90 to the ordinary annual allowance of 5,000*l.*, which had been suspended since the purchase of the *Ansiei Raffaele*.

Few pictures of importance were purchased during the year; but the collection of English pictures was greatly enriched by the hanging of those bequeathed in the previous year by Miss Isabel Constable, amongst which were several important works by her father, John Constable, R.A. The pictures purchased during the year included: (1) *Out of Vote*, "The Assumption of the Virgin," by Juan de Valdes Leal (40*l.*); "Two Landscapes," by Giuseppe Zais (200*l.*); "Portrait of a Youth," by D. del Ghirlandaio (2,000*l.*), and a "Holy Family with Saints," by Girol. Giovenone (320*l.*). (2) *Out of Lewis Fund*, "A Convivial Party," by H. G. Pot (200*l.*). (3) *Out of Clarke Bequest*, "View of Dedham," by T. Gainsborough (210*l.*); "St. Francis" and "St. Mark," by A. Vivarini (200*l.*); "A Family Group," by J. van Bylert (50*l.*); "Musical Pastime," by J. M. Molenaer (126*l.*). (4) *Out of Walker Bequest*, "Christ appearing to the Virgin," of the Flemish School, fifteenth century (800*l.*). The bequests and donations included, from the late Mr. J. S. Beckett, "A Boy Drinking," by Murillo; "The Interior of an Art Gallery," ascribed to P. Breughel; "A Frost Scene," by Aart van der Neer; a "Landscape" by Cuyp, and one by R. Wilson; from Lady Mount-Temple, "Beata Beatrix," by D. G. Rossetti; from Mr. George Holt, a "Portrait of Mrs. Brocas," by F. Cotes, R.A.; from Mr. George Salting, "San Zenobio Restoring to Life a Dead Child," by J. da Empoli; from the Duke of Leinster, a "Portrait of Napoleon I.," by Horace Vernet; from Mr. H. Ward, an "Allegorical Subject," by W. van Poorter; and from Mrs. Wells, a collection of sketches and drawings made in Spain, by Mr. Wells. Lord Savile also presented forty copies (on a reduced scale) of pictures by Rembrandt in the *Hermitage Gallery*, St. Petersburg, and fifty-nine copies of pictures by Velasquez in the *Prado Gallery* at Madrid.

The long-delayed catalogues of the pictures of foreign and British schools purchased, bequeathed, and presented, appeared in the course of the year; and

bore witness to the care and erudition of the director, Sir F. W. Burton, and the keeper, Mr. Charles L. Eastlake, by whom they had been jointly compiled. From it we gather that the total number of pictures hung in the National Gallery belonging to British and foreign schools was 1,280, of which 180 are on loan to other departments and to provincial museums.

The National Portrait Gallery.—The long-standing reproach to our patriotism, in refusing to find an appropriate gallery for the display of our illustrious fellow-countrymen, has been at length removed; but by no action of the Government on behalf of the public. A private gentleman (Mr. W. H. Alexander), who at first desired to remain anonymous, came forward and offered to erect a fitting gallery, provided the Government would find a suitable site within two miles of Charing Cross. Even with this incentive delays were interposed, and the most eligible site, in the vacant ground near Parliament Square, was neglected; but at length, after much pressure, the Government informed the trustees that they had decided upon a plot of land contiguous to the National Gallery, and for this purpose would propose a vote for the purchase of a frontage in the Charing Cross Road which belonged to the London ratepayers. The question of price, however, was not decided before the close of the year, the London County Council asking 7,000*l.* for the plot, for which the First Commissioner of Works offered only 3,750*l.* The chief objection to the scheme was that the erection of the National Portrait Gallery on land which in due course would be required for the progressive extension of the National Gallery would obviously limit the expansion of both galleries, and necessitate a return to the overcrowding of the walls from which the great national collection of pictures had only just been set free. The Director has turned to profitable account his comparative leisure incident upon the removal of the collection from his immediate control. The catalogue of the National Portrait Gallery, which was published during the year, gives not only a masterly appreciation of the artists of whose work specimens are to be found in the collection and the history of each picture, but also a succinct biography of the various personages whose portraits furnish in a sense a pictorial history of Great Britain. By the help of such a catalogue the National Portrait Gallery, which, according to Mr. Scharf's catalogue, contained 808 pictures, students, as well as the general public, can realise what manner of men were those who have left their mark upon our national history.

During the year the pictures of the National Portrait Gallery remained in exile at Bethnal Green; but the trustees were allowed to go on making purchases of portraits, to be exhibited on the completion of their new galleries. The purchases included portraits of Horace, Lord Vere of Tilbury (225*l.* 5*s.*); Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax (94*l.*); Thomas Parker, Earl of Macclesfield (21*l.*); John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester (58*l.*); Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester (40*l.*); and Wm. Chaffinch (40*l.*). The trustees also purchased an interesting picture for 115*l.* 10*s.*, representing the Court of Chancery when, presided over by the Earl of Macclesfield, it held its sittings at the upper end of Westminster Hall.

The British Museum.—In consequence of the persistent efforts of members of Parliament on both sides of the House, the Government at length obtained the consent of the Trustees to the opening of the galleries at night; and with this object a vote for 7,000*l.* was taken during the session. At the same time, and in view of the offer of Major-General Cunningham's collection of Oriental and Greek coins, the amount voted for purchases was increased

by 2,000*l*. Amongst the principal acquisitions of the year, in addition to the Cunningham collection (2,539*l*.), may be mentioned three archaic Etruscan paintings found at Cera in 1874, and now purchased from Professor W. Helbig for 550*l*.; a collection of Pliocene mammalia found in the island of Samos (300*l*.); a portion of the Treasure of Chaourse (nineteen silver objects) found in 1883 at Chaourse, near Moncornet, France (8,251*l*.); a bronze relief (Dionysus and Ariadne), and parts of a bronze and silver vase found in the island of Chalke, near Rhodes (330*l*.); cuneiform tablets, &c., of the reign of Cyrus, Darius, Cambyzes, and some dated 2,300 B.C. (500*l*.); a collection of Arabic MSS., from Dr. Glazer (1,350*l*.); various books from the Crawford and Halliwell Phillips' libraries (440*l*.); an Eliot Bible, dated 1685 (107*l*.); MSS. from the Burton-Constable Library (450*l*.); the correspondence of Jeremy Bentham, purchased from Sir J. D. Hooker (75*l*.); a number of Egyptian antiquities; and several important additions to the Natural History collections. A special grant of 1,000*l*. was also made to the trustees to purchase a volume of rare drawings and silver point etchings by masters of the early Italian schools.

South Kensington Museum.—The liberal support accorded by Parliament to the various sections of the Science and Art Department showed no falling off during the year. The increased importance of technical study, which was urged from many sides, was recognised in a substantial increase in the allowance made to schools of Science and Art, in which the payments on results and the additional grants made to teachers amount to nearly 233,000*l*.; whilst for museums the vote for the purchase of works of art was raised from 7,000*l*. to 10,000*l*., irrespective of the amounts voted for the Edinburgh and Dublin museums. Among the more important purchases of the year the first place should be given to a magnificent Italian tapestry, representing the Nativity, purchased of Signor Castellani for 1,177*l*. In view of the large and valuable collection of Chinese and Oriental objects, the purchase of a Chinese screen in black lacquer with incised decorations for 700*l*. was a less judicious or necessary acquisition. Other noteworthy purchases were three terra-cotta panels by Benedetto da Majano (1,812*l*.); a Pietà in Della Robbia ware (475*l*.); specimens of various schools of Italian faience (316*l*.); an Italian ceiling in painted stucco (1,000*l*.); a Limoges enamel, "The Crucifixion" (400*l*.); and a carved wood cabinet, probably early French (360*l*.). The pictures purchased included "Plymouth Sound," by Copley Fielding (250*l*.); the "Bass Rock," by G. Duncan (170*l*.); "Richmond Hill," by G. Barret (45*l*.); "On the Medway," by E. W. Cooke (121*l*.); "Bergamo," by J. D. Harding (681*l*.); and "Innsbruck," by C. Stanfield (126*l*.).

Amongst the reproductions the most noteworthy were a set of corporation maces (1,256*l*.), by Messrs. Elkington; a model of the Villa Madama (350*l*.), by Mariani; and three casts of the "Christ of Amiens" (226*l*.)—one for each of the three museums of London, Dublin, and Edinburgh; whilst the last named also obtained (476*l*.) a cast of the "Tabernacle" in the church of St. Léonard at Léon.

No steps were taken towards completing the façade of the South Kensington Museum; but, on the other hand, a promise was given that the erection of Science schools more worthy of the nation should be considered before the next meeting of Parliament. The Vice-President of the Council (Sir W. Hart-Dyke) further admitted the unsatisfactory state of things in connection with the reproduction of works of art, and promised to extend the collections.

lent to local museums, and to find money, if required, for the further development of lace-making in Ireland.

The Royal Academy.—The winter exhibition of works by old masters and deceased painters of the British school was of more than usual interest, two rooms being set apart for the display of upwards of fifty of the works of the late Mr. Frank Holl, illustrative of his whole career as an artist. There was also a large collection of works of the French school by Watteau and Lancret, chiefly from the gallery of Sir Richard Wallace, and some remarkable specimens of Rembrandt; as well as 73 fine water-colours of J. M. W. Turner, for which, as in previous years, a room was specially set apart.

To the summer exhibition upwards of 14,000 works of art were, it was reported, sent in for approval; but of these space could only be found for 2,196 (as compared with 1,946 in 1887), of which 1,264 were oil-paintings, 412 water-colours, 200 architectural designs, 188 engravings, &c., and 182 pieces of sculpture.

The pictures purchased out of the funds of the Chantrey Bequest, which was intended for "the best pictures of the year," were: "The Charterhouse Chapel," by Mr. H. Herkomer, A.R.A. (2,200*l.*); "The Prodigal Son," by Mr. J. M. Swan (700*l.*); "All Hands to the Pumps," by Mr. H. S. Tuke (420*l.*); "Sheep Washing in Sussex," by Mr. J. Aumonier (800*l.*); and a water-colour "Germinal," by Mr. L. Smythe (105*l.*); and a small sculptured figure, "Ignis Fatuus," by Mr. H. A. Pegram (105*l.*). Public opinion, however, assigned a high place to Mr. Alma Tadema's "At the Shrine of Venus"; Mr. W. L. Wyllie's "Phantom Ship"; Mr. F. Bramley's "Saved"; Mr. Vicat Cole's "Summons to Surrender"; Mr. L. Fildes' "Sisters"; Sir F. Leighton's "Greek Girls Playing at Ball"; Sir J. E. Millais's "Old Garden"; Mr. MacWhirter's "Constantinople"; Mr. Briton Riviere's "Fool and his Folly"; Mr. J. T. Shannon's portrait of Mrs. Graham; and Mr. Orchardson's "The Young Duke." Among the sculpture, Mr. Onslow Ford's "Singer," and Mr. W. B. Richmond's "Arcadian Shepherd" were the most attractive works.

The gold medals and studentships of the Academy, awarded every alternate year, were carried off by Mr. Herbert James Draper, for historical painting ("An Episode of the Deluge"), and by Mr. W. Goscombe John, for sculpture ("Parting"); that for architecture was not awarded. The Turner Gold Medal fell to Miss Ursula Ward; the Creswick Prize to Miss Elizabeth Nicholl; and the prize for a decorative frieze to Miss Gertrude Demain Hammond's "Harvest Festival." Sir F. Leighton's address to the students was devoted to a masterly survey of the Spanish school of painting and its masters.

The New Gallery.—An exhibition of pictures, relics, &c., relating to the Royal House of Stuart was opened under the direct patronage of her Majesty, who contributed numerous portraits and works of art connected with various members of the Stuart family, from Mary Queen of Scots to Cardinal Henry of York. Many English and Scotch noblemen and families whose ancestors had distinguished themselves in the Jacobite cause, contributed interesting mementos of the times in which they lived; amongst which the linen worn by Charles I. at his execution, lent by the Earl of Ashburnham and Mr. Bewick Blackburn, Mary Stuart's hand bell, lent by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and the Book of Hours carried by her to the scaffold, were among the most interesting objects. The numerous and divergent portraits of Queen Mary revived the controversy respecting her personal appearance, the colour

of her hair, &c., the general verdict being in favour of the face as represented in the picture known as "Le Deuil Blanc," attributed to Janet, and lent by Her Majesty from the Windsor Castle collection.

The Summer Exhibition of pictures by living artists maintained the high standard of excellence by which the opening exhibition was marked, the majority of the most prominent artists of the day contributing. Amongst them were Mr. G. F. Watts, Mr. Burne-Jones, Mr. Alma Tadema, Mr. H. Herkomer, Mr. W. B. Richmond, and others.

In the autumn the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society, established for the purpose of raising the art standard of various handicrafts, held its second exhibition, which was rendered the more useful and attractive by the lectures given upon the various branches of manufacture in which art-training was necessary. The Keswick, Whitechapel, Kensington, Lambeth and other local Art Schools contributed metal-work, wood-carving, pottery, and furniture; and many of the large firms sent objects designed, as well as executed, by their own workmen.

The Grosvenor Gallery.—Three exhibitions were held in this Gallery during the year, that in the winter being limited to works produced in the century preceding the accession of Queen Victoria, Gainsborough, Reynolds, Romney, Opie, and Morland being amongst the best represented. The summer exhibition of works of living artists, amongst which those of H.R.H. the Princess Louise took a well-deserved place, had few distinctive features, and brought into prominence few new artists. The Pastel Exhibition, in the autumn, showed that whilst not a few of our painters in oils and water-colours had attained a certain dexterity in the use of their medium, scarcely any had mastered the more subtle refinements of the art as practised in the last century both in France and in this country.

The Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours, the Royal Institute, the Society of British Artists, and other societies held two or more exhibitions in the course of the year; whilst "dealers' shows" were more numerous than ever—all testifying to a largely increased interest in art, and to a ready sale of countless pictures and works of art, which such exhibitions called forth.

The honours and distinctions awarded to British artists at the Paris "Exposition Universelle" were numerous. Sir F. Leighton, P.R.A., was promoted to be a Commander of the Legion of Honour; Mr. H. Herkomer, A.R.A., was made an officer; and Messrs. Oules, R.A., H. Moore, A.R.A., Leader, A.R.A., Burne-Jones, A.R.A., and J. McN. Whistler, chevaliers of the same Order. "Grands Prix" were also awarded to Messrs. Alma-Tadema and Henry Moore for oil-paintings; to Messrs. Norman Shaw and Calcutt for architectural designs; to Sir F. Leighton, P.R.A., and Mr. A. Gilbert for sculpture; and to Mr. Seymour Haden for etching. Gold medals were also given to Sir F. Leighton, Messrs. Aumonier, Burne-Jones, Stanhope Forbes, H. Herkomer, J. C. Hook, Leader, Orchardson, J. R. Reid, J. T. Shannon, and J. McN. Whistler, for oil-paintings; to Messrs. Alfred East, E. J. Gregory, Walter Langley, Alfred Parsons, and W. L. Wyllie for water-colours; to Mr. Charles Keene for drawing; to Mr. R. W. Macbeth for etching; to Mr. Frank Short for engraving; and to Messrs. Douglas, Fordham, and Webb for architectural designs.

Art Sales.—The most important art sale of the year (July 18) was that of a portion of the Secretan Collection by Messrs. Christie, at which seventeen pictures realised £27,825*l.*, a landscape by Hobbema, which had been sold at

the Demidoff sale in 1880 for 8,880*l.*, fetching 5,460*l.*—the highest price given for any single picture sold by public auction in the year. The water-colour drawings of Mr. William Quilter, deceased, realised (May 18) 21,801*l.*; Colonel Houldsworth's and R. Peacock's (May 4) pictures and drawings, 15,582*l.*; Miss Gwyn's, Earl of Clare's, and pictures by the old masters (June 29), 12,515*l.*; Colonel McMurdo and Rev. R. Gwilt (July 13), 10,324*l.*; modern pictures of Henry Hill, Esq. (May 25), 13,426*l.*; the Hallyn Collection (June 22), 7,236*l.*; Mrs. Sarah Austen's water-colours (April 11), 11,452*l.*; and modern pictures of W. Christie and others (June 1), 9,109*l.*

The highest prices obtained for single pictures were—of works in oils by deceased British artists: J. Hoppner, "Portrait of May Gwyn," 2,382*l.*; G. Mason, "The Blackberry Gatherers," 1,410*l.*; Sir E. Landseer, "Alpine Mastiffs," 1,942*l.*; F. Waller, "The Right of Way," 997*l.*; George Morland, "Children Playing at Soldiers," 985*l.* By living British artists: J. C. Hook, "Kelpburners," 1,071*l.*; Vicat Cole, "Abingdon," 777*l.*; P. R. Morris, "Sons of the Brave," 750*l.*; P. Graham, "A Restless Sea," 997*l.*, and "A Sunny Day," 840*l.*; and Sir John Millais, "Olivia," 682*l.* By old foreign masters: Hobbema, "Landscape with Water-mill," 5,460*l.*; and another of the same subject, 3,465*l.*; Rembrandt, "Death of Lucrezia," 3,937*l.*; L. Da Vinci, "The Laughing Boy," 1,758*l.*; Franz Hals, "A Lady in Black," 1,680*l.*; and Rubens, "The Greek and Assyrian Magi," 892*l.* By modern foreign masters: J. F. Millet, "Le Vanneur," 3,570*l.*; Troyon, "The Heights of Suresnes," 3,045*l.*, and "La Garde Chasse," 2,940*l.*; Rosa Bonheur, "Breton Oxen," 2,725*l.*; A. Décamps, "An Eastern Courtyard," 2,142*l.*; E. Delacroix, "Columbus at the Monastery," 1,202*l.*, and "The Giaour," 1,302*l.*; and Meissonier, "La Vedette," 1,680*l.*, and "Les Mousquetaires," 1,812*l.* Among the water-colours, the highest prices given were for D. Cox's "Vale of Clwyd," 2,415*l.*; P. De Wint's "Lancaster," 1,155*l.*, and "Lincoln," 1,758*l.*; Copley Fielding's "Fairy Lake," 908*l.*; J. F. Lewis's "Lilium Auratum," 1,050*l.*; and J. M. W. Turner's "Heidelberg," 1,165*l.*, and "Oberwesel," 1,071*l.*

Among the other important sales were those of Mr. Argent's porcelain (3,127*l.*); Lord Lucan's ditto (2,261*l.*); Dr. J. B. Ashford's (4,809*l.*); Lord Arundell of Wardour's porcelain and furniture (10,568*l.*); Hon. R. Marsham's collection of coins (3,036*l.*); the Earl of Hopetoun's library (3,117*l.*); F. Perkins's library (3,222*l.*); G. W. Bieber's coins (3,682*l.*); General Yorke Moore's Roman and Greek coins (5,806*l.*); Rembrandt etchings of J. Webster (3,058*l.*); Mr. Dyneley's library (3,084*l.*); Mr. J. M. Mackenzie's (7,072*l.*); the Duke of Buccleuch's (portion) (3,705*l.*); Sir T. Thornhill's (2,080*l.*); the Earl of Crawford's (second portion) (7,324*l.*); the Burton-Constable library and manuscripts (3,098*l.*); and the manuscripts of the Duke of Hamilton (15,189*l.*), resold by the Berlin Government—amongst which a Codex or Evangelarium, presented to Henry VIII. by Leo X. on conferring the title of "Defensor Fidei," realised 1,500*l.*; a copy of Diodorus Siculus, with a miniature of Francis I. enthroned, 1,000*l.*; an Officium Div. Mar. Virg., illustrated by Geoffrey Tory, 1,230*l.*; and a copy of "Les Illustres Malheureux" of Bocaccio, with miniatures by a Burgundian artist, 1,700*l.* At the Hopetoun sale a Mazarin Bible realised 2,000*l.*

DRAMA.

The success which has attended the production of plays of home growth is a conspicuous and satisfactory feature of the dramatic year. The phenomenal runs attained by certain pieces of the preceding year, notably Mr. Pinero's "Sweet Lavender" and Mr. Buchanan's "Joseph's Sweetheart," were distinct triumphs for English dramatic art; and this year by far the larger number of plays of anything like serious aim must be set to the credit of native authors. Mr. Pinero's four-act play, "The Profligate," produced at the opening of the Garrick Theatre under Mr. Hare, was conceived in a somewhat heavier vein than the author's recent efforts, and was even criticised as being too didactic. But it bore all the marks of skilful workmanship, and, with the assistance of a strong cast, comprising Miss Olga Nethersole, Mrs. Gaston Murray, and Miss Kate Rorke, and Messrs. Hare, Forbes Robertson, and Waller, did not fail of a warm reception or a good run. Another play from the same pen, "The Weaker Sex," produced at the Court on March 16, though containing many laughable passages, was more than usually serious in tone. It was admirably acted by Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, who were well supported, and ran till May 25, when it gave place to Mr. Sydney Grundy's three-act piece, "A White Lie." This play, in spite of certain weak points in the construction, won much commendation for well-written dialogue, and in the hands of Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, Miss Olga Brandon, Mr. Dacre and others, achieved a distinct success. On the whole, however, the palm for the production of original work of the higher kind must be awarded to Mr. H. A. Jones, whose two plays, "Wealth" and "The Middleman," rank as remarkable achievements. The former, produced at the Haymarket, April 27, if it did not entirely realise its high aim, was marked by both originality and power. Painted with a strong brush, with a view to show the evils of a sordid worship of gold, its most prominent character, played with remarkable ability by Mr. B. Tree, was neither sympathetic nor attractive. On the other hand, Mrs. Tree, as the heroine, was provided with a really pretty part, to which she did full justice; and the remainder of the cast, including Miss Norreys and Messrs. Brookfield, Kemble, W. Grossmith, Maurice, and Hargreaves, afforded adequate support. Its reception, though very favourable, was not comparable to that which awaited Mr. Jones's other effort, "The Middleman." The enthusiastic welcome accorded to this play on its appearance at the re-opening of the Shaftesbury Theatre on August 27 must have been marked with a white stone by all *habitués* of "first nights." Its success was generally acknowledged to be well deserved, and, independently of its intrinsic merit, it provided a part for Mr. Willard which enabled him to exhibit his talents as an emotional actor, and afforded full scope for Miss Maude Millett's tender and sympathetic art as the heroine. It ran throughout the rest of the year with every prospect of permanent popularity. Messrs. G. R. Sims and H. Pettitt continued their successful collaboration in the field of melodrama. "London Day by Day," which succeeded the "Silver Falls" at the Adelphi, although it constituted in some respects a departure from the old methods of these dramatists, showed that they knew their audiences thoroughly, and bid fair to rival its predecessor in popular favour. The cast was efficient, comprising Miss Alma Murray, Miss Mary Rorke, Miss Clara Jecks (who was provided with a congenial comic part), and Messrs. Alexander and Marius, the latter

figuring as a singularly mild-mannered stage villain. Such support, aided by some excellent and familiar London street scenes, fully justified success. The other venture of the joint authors, also a complete success, was entitled "Master and Man," and followed the withdrawal of Mr. Brandon Thomas's "Gold Craze" at the Princess's towards the close of the year. With regard to the last-named piece, it may be said that, though a failure, it was not destitute of merit, and with judicious pruning might easily have been pulled through by the competent cast. Messrs. Hall Caine and Wilson Barrett's four-act drama, "The Good Old Times," which appeared at the Princess's Feb. 12, though it had a fair run, was distinctly inferior to their previous effort, "Ben-my-Chree"; and the historical play by Messrs. Hamilton and Augustus Harris—"The Royal Oak," Drury Lane, Sept. 23—owed everything to spectacular effects. Mr. Buchanan's comedy-drama, "The Old Home," met with a very fair reception at the Vaudeville, June 19, credit for which was largely due to Miss Winifred Emery and Messrs. Thorne and Cyril Maude. At the Opera Comique a play called "Tares," by Mrs. Oscar Bernger, achieved fair and on the whole well-deserved success; but "The Panel Picture," by Mr. Outram Tristram, which followed it, failed, in spite of the meritorious efforts of Lady Monckton. The number of original farces produced has been somewhat less than usual. Two of the best specimens were from the pens of playwrights hitherto unknown to fame. These were "Aunt Jack," by Mr. R. Lumley, which provoked shouts of laughter at the Court (July 18), with Mrs. John Wood in the chief part, and "Our Flat," by Mrs. Musgrave, produced at the Prince of Wales's June 18, placed in the evening bill at the Opera Comique June 25, and afterwards removed to the Strand; both plays running into the new year. Mr. J. P. Hurst's farcical comedy, "Æsop's Fables," which appeared at the Strand on the conclusion of the successful run of Messrs. Darnley and Manville Fenn's "Balloon," was not at first well received. The amusing acting of Miss Alma Stanley and Mr. Penley, however, eventually secured success. Mr. Buchanan's "fantastic comedy" "That Dr. Cupid," Vaudeville, June 14, in spite of its extravagance, obtained a good run in the hands of Miss Winifred Emery and Messrs. Frank Gillmore, Cyril Maude, and the two Thornes; and Mr. Burnand's "Headless Man," produced at the Criterion, July 27, would in all probability have done the same had its career not been cut short by Mr. Wyndham's departure for America. Burlesque, as formerly understood, has practically ceased to exist; but a variety of more recent growth still holds sway at the Gaiety, where Messrs. Leslie and Clark's "Ruy Blas," produced on the return of the company from America and Australia, Sept. 21, kept the stage throughout the year. Richard Henry's musical burlesque, "Lancelot the Lovely," also had some success at the Avenue, where work of this kind is much in vogue.

Although, as has been said above, most of the leading plays of the year were of home origin, some few adaptations require to be chronicled. At the Haymarket Mr. Buchanan scored a distinct success on Sept. 12 with his version of MM. Jules Mary and Grisier's drama "Roger la Honte" under the name of "A Man's Shadow," which provided Mr. B. Tree with a striking, but very exacting, double part. The long run of the piece was due in a great measure to some excellent French scenes, and to the skill of the exponents, among whom were Mrs. B. Tree, Miss Julia Neilson, Miss Norreys, and a very clever child, Miss Minnie Terry, and Messrs. Fernandez and Collette. The adaptation was on the whole far stronger than the original.

If the same cannot be said of Messrs. Grove and Hamilton's version of "La Tosca," at the Garrick, it may be admitted that the concessions to English taste, though, perhaps, tending in some respects to weaken M. Sardou's play, at least mitigated its horrors. As a vehicle for the talents of Mrs. Bernard Beere, the part of Floria Tosca did not disappoint the expectations which had been formed of it, her impersonation being scarcely inferior to that of Mme. Bernhardt, on which it was to a certain extent based. The support afforded by Mr. Forbes Robertson's striking performance of Scarpia was all that could be desired; and the cast generally, comprising Miss Rose Leclercq and Messrs. Waring, Waller, and Gilbert Farquhar, as well as the dresses and scenery, were eminently satisfactory. Two adaptations, by Mr. William Archer, from the Norwegian dramatist, Henrik Ibsen, made their appearance: the one, entitled "A Doll's House," at the Novelty; the other, "The Pillars of Society," at the Opera Comique; but, while evoking considerable interest and discussion in the press, neither achieved more than a *succès d'estime*. Among lighter specimens of the adapter's work which won popular favour may be mentioned Mr. W. Cooper's version of A. Bisson's comedy, "Une Mission Délicate," under the name of "Angelina" (Vaudeville, May 9), in which Mr. Cyril Maude did full justice to a very suitable part; and "The Bungalow," by Mr. F. Horner, at Toole's, October 7, from a piece entitled "La Garçonnière," produced at the Déjazet in 1888. The latter, first played for copyright purposes at the Prince of Wales's, under the name of "Bachelor's Quarters," was a striking instance of survival after a somewhat hostile reception by both critics and public.

The revivals included a sufficient quantity of Shakespearean work. At the close of the long and brilliant run of Macbeth at the Lyceum (see Drama, 1888) Mr. Irving deserted Shakespeare for a time; but early in January Mr. B. Tree placed on the stage at the Haymarket a very satisfactory performance of the "Merry Wives of Windsor," with a children's ballet by Madame Katti Lanner, and charming and well-rendered incidental music by Sir A. Sullivan. The cast comprised Mr. Tree as Falstaff, and Mrs. Tree as Anne Page; Mrs. Ford was played first by Miss Lingard and afterwards by Miss Lindley, and Miss Rose Leclercq was Mrs. Page. The representation of "Richard III." at the Globe was marked by much artistic care, and fully deserved the recognition it obtained from the public. Mr. Mansfield's Richard was a thoughtful study, and, with the support of Misses Mary Rorke, Carlotta Leclercq, and Bessie Hatton, and of Messrs. Beaumont, Fernandez and Norman-Forbes, the *ensemble* left little to be desired. Mr. Wilson Barrett renewed his impersonations of Hamlet at the Princess's, with Miss Eastlake as Ophelia, in the early part of the year; and towards its close Mr. Benson initiated a season of Shakespeare at the Globe by a pleasing representation of "A Midsummer Night's Dream," with Mendelssohn's music.

The play chosen by Mr. Irving to follow "Macbeth" at the Lyceum was a recast of Watts Phillips's drama of the French Revolution, "The Dead Heart." Originally produced by Mr. Benjamin Webster at the Adelphi, it was now entrusted for purposes of revision to Mr. W. H. Pollock, who performed the task with judgment and moderation. In the hands of Mr. Irving the part of Landry became very impressive, and Mr. Bancroft gave a forcible rendering of Latour. Miss E. Terry's part was too slight to give full scope to her powers; but her son, Mr. Gordon Craig, made a successful *début* as Arthur de Valéry. The Criterion has been the scene of some successful revivals. Early in January Mrs. Bernard Beere created a sensation by her clever and original imper-

sonation of Mrs. Sternhold in Tom Taylor's "Still Waters Run Deep"; while Mr. Wyndham's interesting and sympathetic John Mildmay marked an advance in his rendering of serious parts. Other characters were adequately represented by Miss Mary Moore and Messrs. Standing and Blakeley, and the play kept the stage for a considerable time. On the departure of Mr. Wyndham for America, the favourite farce "Betsy" was revived, with Miss Lottie Venne and Messrs. Standing and Giddens in their old parts, showing little or no falling off in popularity; and in October "Caste," with Mr. David James as Eccles, Mr. Elwood as Captain Hawtree, and Miss Olga Brandon as Esther, supported by Miss Lottie Venne and Messrs. Brookfield and Boyne, gave fresh evidence of its powerful hold on the public taste. "Jim the Penman" was chosen for the reopening of the Shaftesbury Theatre in June, the cast comprising Mr. Willard, as before, in the leading part, Lady Monckton as the wife, and Messrs. Mackintosh, W. Herbert, and F. Terry; at the Princess's short but satisfactory revivals of the "Silver King" and "Claudian" took place in the spring; and Miss Geneviève Ward reappeared in the powerful play "Forget-me-Not" at some matinées at the Opera Comique. Judging by the cordial reception which greeted its revival at the Comedy in November, Mr. Albery's amusing adaptation "Pink Dominoes" has now earned the right to be classed among perennial farces.

Comic opera, though, as regards quantity, it was plentifully represented, does not offer very much of importance to chronicle. The most prominent specimen during the year was Mr. Gilbert and Sir A. Sullivan's piece "The Gondoliers," which succeeded "The Yeomen of the Guard" at the Savoy late in the year. Mr. Gilbert here reverted to the line of *quasi-burlesque* so successfully treated in the "Mikado" and other pieces, but more or less abandoned in the "Yeomen of the Guard." The music, though full of the grace and beauty which mark nearly everything proceeding from Sir A. Sullivan's pen, was also somewhat more trivial in character. The cast included Misses Ulmar, Jessie Bond, Brandram, and Decima Moore (a new comer), and Messrs. Courtice Pounds, Rutland Barrington, Denny, and F. Wyatt; but Mr. Grossmith, who has been so long and prominently connected with these pieces, was absent. The orchestra and chorus exhibited the same proof of careful training as on former occasions; and, from the reception of the work, there seems every reason to anticipate that it will add another link to the unbroken chain of successes which has attended this collaboration. Mr. H. B. Farnie's comic opera "Paul Jones," which was produced in January at the Prince of Wales's under the auspices of the Carl Rosa Light Opera Company, was an adaptation of MM. Chivot and Durn's "Surcouf," with music by Robert Planquette. Its career was singularly successful. Messrs. Stephenson and Cellier's comedy-opera "Doris" (Lyric, April 20), though not unsuccessful, failed to attain anything like the popularity of its predecessor, "Dorothy." "The Red Hussar," by Messrs. Pottinger-Stephens and E. Solomon, which appeared at the Lyric, Nov. 23, continued in full swing at the end of the year, and, in spite of the feeble libretto, seemed likely, through the excellent rendering of the music by Miss Marie Tempest and Mr. Ben Davies, to secure a more than respectable run.

Concurrently with the decline of adaptations from foreign sources already alluded to, there has been an increasing supply of French dramatic art presented in the original language by French exponents. Early in the year the Royalty was the scene of some admirable representations of standard French plays by a detachment from the Comédie Française, including Mlle. Reichem-

berg, Mme. Malvan, and Messrs Coquelin Cadet and Boucher, and later on the same theatre was visited by the company of the "*Théâtre Libre*," a society of a semi-private nature, whose vocation was understood to be the production of works of a somewhat *outré* character. However that may be, the plays chosen for presentment here did not invite attack on that score, while the acting, of which realism was the prevailing feature, exhibited considerable power. During the summer a third French company gave a series of performances at the Gaiety, in the course of which Mlle. Jane Hading and M. Coquelin repeated "Le Gendre de M. Poirier," "Le Voyage de M. Perrichon," and other familiar plays, to delighted audiences.

6

MUSIC.

The rehabilitation of Italian opera at Covent Garden under the auspices of Mr. Augustus Harris ranks as the most memorable episode in the history of the musical year. Mr. Harris's prospectus was by no means adventurous as regards the introduction of unknown operas. Even Verdi's latest opera "Otello," the most important dramatic work of recent years, was omitted from it, and the honour of introducing that masterpiece to a London audience fell to M. Mayer. On the other hand, no undue prominence was given to the class of Italian operas which, however melodious, have lost so much of their interest through constant repetition. The policy of the impresario in gathering round him a very large company of competent artists, rather than relying on the attraction of a few stars, bore good fruit in a satisfactory rendering of every opera performed, while some, such as "Figaro" and "The Huguenots," challenged comparison with any previous representations of those works. Bizet's "Les Pêcheurs de Perles" ("I Pescatori di Perle"), though it was introduced in England two years back by Mr. Mapleson, served as an interesting *quasi* novelty for the opening night, on May 18. Though altogether inferior to "Carmen," it is full of weird and original melody, and seems likely to achieve a certain amount of permanent popularity. The performance of Gounod's "Roméo et Juliette" in French, with Mme. Melba as Juliette, Mons. Jean de Reszké as Roméo, and M. E. de Reszké as the Friar, fully justified what was looked upon by many as a doubtful experiment. Wagner's comic masterpiece, "Die Meistersinger," cleverly Italianised by Signor Mazzucato, was given in a style that extorted praise even from the somewhat exacting followers of the German master. The cast was exceptionally strong, comprising Mme. Albani, MM. Jean de Reszké, Lassalle, Montariol, Abramoff, Winigradow (a survivor of the ill-starred Russian company of 1888), and a Belgian artist, M. Isnardon, who had previously played the part of Beckmesser in Brussels. Most of the leading artists who supported Mr. Harris's season during the ten weeks it lasted were already well known to the London public. The *répertoire* did not afford to such sopranis as Mme. Albani, Ella Russell, Marie Roze, Nordica, Fursch-Madi, or Valda, or to a contralto like Mme. Scalan, much opportunity of doing more than sustaining the reputation they have already won. The steady progress of Miss McIntyre as a dramatic artist, particularly as shown by her impersonation of the double part in Bortolotti's "Mefistofele," and the increase of power which experience has brought to Mme. Melba, are, however, points which require notice. The fine rendering of the part of Valentina by the Viennese soprano, Mme. Toni-Schläger, was a leading feature of the performance of "The Huguenots,"

alluded to above ; and the reappearance after several years' absence of Mlle. Van Zandt showed that she had lost nothing of her charming and finished vocalisation. M. Jean de Reszké is now generally recognised as the most gifted exponent of leading tenor parts since Mario left the stage, and Signori Montariol, Massimi and A. D'Andrade (a brother of the well-known baritone) were useful accessions to the second rank of operatic tenors. M. Talazac, of the Paris Opéra Comique, though an accomplished artist, was probably wrong in transferring his efforts to the stage of Covent Garden. The baritone and bass parts were brilliantly supported by MM. Lassalle, Edouard de Reszké, F. D'Andrade, Abramoff, and Winigradow. Such a cast, aided by an excellent orchestra and the most efficient chorus that has been heard for many years past, does much to account for the phenomenal success of Mr. Harris's season. A short series of Italian opera, mostly confined to well-worn specimens of the art, was given at Her Majesty's Theatre by Mr. Mapleson ; but although some of the performances were creditable enough, the venture was not on the whole successful : a proof, if any fresh proof were needed, that one Italian opera on a grand scale is as much as the present demand will support at one time. At the Lyceum, in July, M. Mayer no doubt upset this theory in a very exceptional case. Verdi's "Otello" had never been heard before in England, and the excitement which attended its production at La Scala in Milan (Feb. 1887) was still fresh in the memory of opera-goers. Moreover, M. Mayer showed great wisdom, having once undertaken the enterprise, in securing the Scala company, with Signor Faccio as conductor of the fine orchestra. The title rôle was magnificently sung by Signor Tamagno, and Mons. Maurel, as Iago, justified the praise which had been freely accorded to his impersonation in Italy. The Italian libretto is by Signor Arrigo Boito, the gifted composer and librettist of "Mefistofele."

English opera has suffered a temporary eclipse, owing no doubt in a great measure to the lamented death of Mr. Carl Rosa ; but the thoughtful and artistic performance of Goetz' "Taming of the Shrew" by the Royal College of Music, under Dr. Villiers Stanford, gives ground for hope that this branch of the art will not be neglected by students of music in this country.

In the concert-room native talent was fortunately more active than on the boards ; and, what is just as important, it received due encouragement from the leading orchestral conductors. No attempt was made by Mr. Manns to disturb the old traditions of the Crystal Palace concerts. The renderings of classical works were no less perfect than of yore, while of the new material introduced into the programmes a large proportion was English. Of the spring series the most interesting novelties were Dr. Villiers Stanford's symphony in F major, No. 4, given on Feb. 23, and Mr. Frederick Cliffe's symphony in C minor (Op. 1), produced at Mr. Manns' benefit concert on April 20. The former had already passed the ordeal of a concert in Berlin, together with other of the composer's works ; and the latter excited the greatest interest among musicians as the maiden orchestral work of a very young composer, on account of its ambitious aim, which was, however, fully justified by its reception here and at subsequent performances. An overture by Mr. E. Prout, composed expressly for these concerts, the idea inspired by Sir W. Scott's "Rokeby," obtained a very favourable first hearing on March 23, and Mr. J. C. Ames' pianoforte concerto in C minor (Op. 8) was successfully introduced on April 18 by Mr. Oscar Beringer. An important novelty of the spring series was Berlioz' gloomy but striking *Marche Funèbre*, from the last scene of "Hamlet" (Op. 18, No. 3), the first performance of which took

place on March 2. The thirty-fourth series commenced on Oct. 19, and lasted till Dec. 14, in the course of which Dr. Scholz' symphony in B flat (Op. 60), Mr. F. J. Simpson's concert overture, "Robert Bruce," a rhapsody in A and D by Lalo, and a ballad by Grieg, entitled "Landkjending," for orchestra, with male voice solo and chorus, were introduced to an English audience. The performances of vocal works at these concerts are still of subordinate interest; but the production, on Feb. 16, of Mr. Hamish McCunn's "Lay of the Last Minstrel," a work strongly tinged with national colour, and of Mr. Cowen's cantata, "St. John's Eve" (Dec. 14), deserve to be chronicled as creditable achievements.

The seventy-seventh season of the Philharmonic Concerts, which opened on March 14, entirely disposed of the charge of sluggishness which at one time threatened the directors. The series owed, perhaps, as much of its brilliancy to the appearance in person of the renowned composers Tchaikowsky and Grieg as to the inherent excellence of the novelties produced. Mr. Cowen, who is now the regular conductor, was prevented from taking the *bâton* at the first concert by his duties at the Melbourne Exhibition; but his place was taken by Dr. Mackenzie, who conducted his own Scotch Rhapsody No. 2 (Burns). At the same concert Herr Grieg conducted his orchestral suite (Op. 46), which forms part of the incidental music to Ibsen's drama "Peers Gynt," and Madame Grieg sang some of her husband's songs, while a young artist, Mlle. Geisler-Schubert, a talented pupil of Mme. Schumann, played with remarkable ability Schumann's Pianoforte Concerto. Dr. Hubert Parry's new symphony in C, produced on May 23, was enthusiastically received by the audience, and on the whole very favourably criticised. Tchaikowsky's new symphony No. 5 in E minor, pianoforte concerto No. 2, and suite for orchestra in D major were also included in the programmes of the highly successful season which came to a close on June 22.

The prevailing feature of the Richter Concerts, which commenced on May 6, was a still further increase in the amount of Wagnerian music included in the programmes. The policy was apparently justified, as the subscribers increased in number. The first performance in St. James's Hall of the choral part of the Grail scene from "Parsifal" aroused attention, though it revealed certain imperfections in the chorus which called for amendment. A new symphony in E minor, composed expressly for these concerts by Dr. Hubert Parry, was played on July 1, and was generally pronounced worthy of the high reputation so rapidly acquired by the composer. Among the most notable events of the series were the concert on May 20, given in commemoration of Wagner's birthday, when an enormous crowd applauded familiar specimens of the master's work; the *début* of the gifted concert singer, Fraulein Hermine Spies, who rendered songs by Schubert, Brahms, and others, with unrivalled excellence, creating a great impression, which was afterwards confirmed at recitals given by her elsewhere; and the closing scene of the *Gotterdammerung*, in which the part of Brunnhilde was very finely sang by Fraulein Fillunger. The brilliant season closed on July 8 with a performance of Berlioz' "Faust."

The London Symphony Concerts, under Herr Henschel, were resumed early in the year and came to a close for the time on February 27, when Mr. Broughton's famous Leeds choir made its first appearance in London, and gave a powerful rendering of Beethoven's "Choral Symphony" and Mendelssohn's "Walpurgisnacht." A new overture by Tchaikowsky, and Weber's entr'acte from the "Three Pintos" (first appearance in London), were among

the most novel items in these programmes. The series was resumed in the winter months. Other orchestral concerts were given by Señor Sarasate and by Sir Charles Hallé. The former owed, no doubt, most of their attractions to the talents of the great violinist himself, though the orchestra, under Mr. Cusins, was far from inefficient. The latter afforded London concert-goers an opportunity of listening to the admirable orchestra which has made and still keeps up the fame of the conductor's concerts in Manchester.

Chamber music was represented this year under exceptionally favourable conditions. In addition to the Saturday and Monday Popular Concerts, which continued their career with undiminished success, in the hands mainly of the artists who have done so much to make them successful, Sir Charles Hallé gave a series, commencing early in May. A great deal of interesting new material was introduced into the programmes; three posthumous quartets by Cherubini, in E, in F, and in A minor, respectively, being the most conspicuous examples. A pianoforte trio in E flat, by Martucci, Tchaikowsky's trio in A minor (Op. 50), and Wagner's sonata in A, which, though written in 1853, had not been previously heard in London, were further novelties; while Brahms' sonata in D minor, for violin and piano, and Dvořák's quartet in E (Op. 80), first introduced at a concert given by Mr. Harvey Lohr in April, were specimens of recent music very favourably received. The chamber-music concerts given by Messrs. Ludwig and Whitehouse at Prince's Hall, and the piano recitals of Herr Schönberger and M. de Pachmann, among others, also appealed successfully to the increasing appetite for this kind of music; while the four concerts given by the Wind Instrument Chamber Music Society proved that there still exists a demand for this interesting but hitherto much neglected branch of the art.

Concurrently with the growth of instrumental music, both orchestral and chamber, there appears to be a diminution in the demand for the class of work which depends chiefly upon vocal execution. Within recent years the "Sacred Harmonic Society," the "London Musical Society," and Messrs. Leslie's and Willing's choirs have disappeared from the scene, and this year the demise of Novello's choir must be added to the list. The final season of this excellent society was signalised by the first performance in London of Dudley Buck's cantata, "The Light of Asia," founded on Sir Edwin Arnold's well-known poem. It is a melodious work, and under Dr. Mackenzie's direction obtained a sufficiently favourable reception. Mackenzie's new and beautiful choral work, "The Dream of Jubal," composed for the jubilee of the Liverpool Philharmonic, was introduced to Londoners during the season, and a revival in curtailed form of Handel's little-known oratorio, "Saul," was of interest to many. On the demise of Novello's concerts, Mr. A. Littleton joined the directorate of the Royal Choral Society at the Albert Hall, where Mr. Barnby's splendid chorus, strengthened still further by the accession of some of the members of the defunct society, maintained its eminent position. The first performance in England of M. Benoit's "Lucifer" must be credited to this society, as well as the introduction to the London public of Mancinelli's "Isaias," produced at the festival at Norwich in the preceding year. Revivals of Spohr's "Calvary" and "The Fall of Babylon" were due to the Borough of Hackney Choral Association, which, under Mr. Prout, has attained a high state of efficiency. The Bach choir, under Dr. V. Stanford, continued the revivals of old music, two of Bach's cantatas being among the most interesting specimens.

The sixth Triennial Festival was held at Leeds in October, and was a

brilliant success, both musically and financially. Five novelties were included in the programmes, the most important being Dr. Hubert Parry's setting of Pope's ode on "St. Cecilia's Day," which, under the composer's direction, met with an enthusiastic reception, and rapidly became popular in all musical circles; and Dr. Villiers Stanford's scholarly and artistic arrangement of Tennyson's ballad "The Voyage of Maeldune," Mr. Corder's cantata "The Sword of Argantyr," a long and important work of the modern school, and Dr. Creser's cantata, "The Sacrifice of Freia," written for the festival, were both adaptations of old Norse legends, in the former case the composer himself being the librettist. The remaining novelty was a suite for violin, entitled "Fibroch," by Dr. Mackenzie, splendidly played by Señor Sarasate, for whom it was specially written. The solo parts were sustained, as usual at Leeds, by the greatest artists procurable, Mme. Albani, Mme. Valleria, and Messrs. Lloyd, Barrington Foote, Watkin Mills, and Brereton being among the singers engaged. The orchestra, under Sir A. Sullivan, also left nothing to be desired; but it was remarked that the choir was less efficient in some of the new works than might have been expected from its past achievements, though in such well-known music as the "Lobgesang" and the "Golden Legend," it showed all its old power. The one hundred and sixty-sixth Festival of the Three Choirs was this year held at Gloucester, in September, and was in every respect a success. Mr. Lee Williams, under whose direction a most satisfactory chorus was gathered, added greatly to his reputation as a composer by the new cantata, "The Last Night at Bethany," produced in the Cathedral on September 4. The music is of a deeply religious character, and the libretto by Mr. Joseph Bennett possesses considerable literary merit. The work received full justice at the hands of Mme. Albani, Miss Hilda Wilson, and Messrs. Lloyd and Brereton. The programmes besides a performance of the "Golden Legend" under Sir A. Sullivan, comprised a revival of the composer's earliest oratorio, "The Prodigal Son," produced at Worcester in 1869.

A performance of "Elijah" at the Crystal Palace, on "Handel Festival scale," which took place in the summer, was so triumphant a success as to warrant the hope that a Mendelssohn festival may one day become a reality.

SCIENCE OF THE YEAR.

THE past year has been remarkable for the successful completion of many of the most gigantic undertakings ever attempted by man. The triumphs of applied science have seldom been at once so vast and so numerous. After ten years' work the Forth Bridge, with its two spans, each nearly one-third of a mile in length, has been completed, while abroad the Sukkur Bridge in India, the Hawkesbury Bridge in New South Wales, and the Poughkeepsie Bridge over the Hudson have also been finished, and the twenty-four miles of channel between England and France have not deterred engineers from preparing plans for a bridge to unite the two countries. The French Exhibition was not only remarkable as being the biggest, the best, and the most popular ever held, but also as containing some of the greatest novelties in engineering. Allusion was made to the Eiffel Tower in former years, but its height and construction are perhaps inferior in real interest to the roof of the machinery-hall, with its arch stretching from side to side, a distance of 370 feet without support, an achievement which, perhaps, only a trained engineer can fully appreciate.

The gigantic electric-lighting station at Deptford, providing for nearly half a million incandescent lights, will suffice to show that electrical progress is being conducted on a similarly grand scale, while we have to record even a greater feat in the domain of travel in the triple march of Stanley's expedition in Central Africa.

MECHANICS.

One of the most ingenious exhibits at the Paris Exhibition was the hydraulic railway, or "*chemin de fer glissant*," of M. Barre. This system of railway propulsion is based on the invention of M. Girard, which was patented in 1864; but it has been converted by M. Barre from a mere theoretical novelty into an actual working scheme. The chief feature in the "*chemin de fer glissant*" is the method in which the friction of the carriages is reduced by forcing a thin film of water between the rail and the slider or skate, which takes the place of the wheel of ordinary rolling-stock. By this means the force required to move the vehicles is enormously reduced. This motive force is furnished by a series of water jets placed centrally between the two rails in such a position as to impinge against the carriages. The opening and shutting of these jets is adjusted automatically by the movement of the carriage, so as to prevent waste of water and unnecessary loss of power, so that it is only when the train is actually passing over the nozzles that the water-pressure is in operation. To produce the water-film under the sliders of the carriage a pressure of ten atmospheres is sufficient, and this is provided by cylinders attached to the carriages. Very high speeds—up to 120 miles an hour—are considered practicable by the inventor, but the difficulties due to alteration of gradient, curves, and junctions will probably prevent the carrying out of such a railway beyond the experimental stage. A new motor has been put on the market in Messrs. Woodbury's hot-air engine. This engine is said to be capable of giving 30 to 32 horse-power, with an hourly

consumption of less than 2 lbs. of coal per horse-power. Another important invention which has been put into commercial use during the year is the type-setting machine of Mr. Mergenthaler, known as the "linotype." The linotype differs from all previous type-setting machines in the fact that the type is cast in the machine while only the moulds are set. The usual keyboard action results in the setting of a line of moulds, into which type-metal is run, the result being that a solid line of type is pushed out of the machine. The saving of time is reported to be considerable, but misprints appear to be of rather frequent occurrence, as these errors cannot be corrected without sacrificing much of the lines in which they appear. A series of trials of marine engines has been begun by Professor Kennedy and a committee of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers, in order to determine the relative value of different types of marine engine for mercantile purposes. The value of these trials will be evident when it is remembered that the differences between the triple and quadruple expansion engines have been fiercely debated in past years. Ship canals have been energetically pushed towards completion. The Manchester Ship Canal has made great progress; other large canals are approaching completion, while between the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of St. Lawrence the railway has been begun which is to do away with the necessity for a canal, by taking ships of 1,000 tons burthen on sixteen-wheel trucks from sea to sea, without unloading and without injuriously straining the framework of the ship. This railway will be seventeen miles long, and will consist of two parallel lines of standard gauge eighteen feet apart. The trucks will be fitted with cradles adaptable to the varying shapes of the hull of the vessel to be carried, and will be drawn by ordinary locomotives. At each end of the line the ships will be raised or lowered to the water by powerful hydraulic lifts. A new underground railway in London, from the City to Stockwell, has been nearly completed. This differs from previous underground railways by being carried at such a distance below ground as effectually to prevent interference with buildings or streets. The depth varies from fifty to sixty feet, the line consisting of two separate tunnels, running for most of the distance one under the other. The success and speed with which such railways can be made have stimulated promoters to apply for Parliamentary powers for other lines of the same character in various parts of the metropolis. During the past year Japan completed its first thousand miles of railway, and its neighbour, China, has planned a line 700 miles long, from Peking to Hankow.

PHYSICS.

Electricity has been put to a new use during the past year by the legislature of the State of New York. A law was passed by which criminals condemned to death were to be executed by an alternating electric current of high potential. A more interesting application of electricity can be found in the process of tanning. It is claimed that the time occupied in the tanning of leather can be materially reduced if a current is sent through the bath or pit in which the hides are soaking. A new electric tramway has also been opened for general traffic at Northfleet. This line differs from those already working in the fact that the cars are run on the "series" and not on the "parallel" system; that is, the current passes from an insulated rail to the car, through the motor on the car, and then again to the rail, so that if a number of cars were running on the line at the same time the current would

pass through them all. The connection between the insulated line and the motor is made by an "arrow" moving in a slot in one of the rails between a series of clips or spring-jacks. The current is kept constant by Statter's current regulator. The welding of metals by electricity seems also to be approving itself as of great value. Experiments on wrought-iron joints electrically welded show that the fibrous structure of the iron is particularly well marked at the line of junction, and much more homogeneous in character than in other parts of the bar. Improvements in telegraph apparatus have been made by Mr. Langdon Davies, so as to increase the number of messages that can be sent over one wire at the same time. Similar arrangements have also been devised by Edison and by Rysselberghe.

A magnetic survey of the British Isles by Professors Rucker and Thorpe has been for some years in progress. Some of the results of this survey are extremely interesting, since after obtaining a normal magnetic field, and comparing this field with the observations, residual quantities were left, which must have been due to local magnetic disturbing forces, and from these the centres of local disturbance can be detected. These results may enable magnetic observation to be used geologically in the location of deep-seated rocks, the local centres being probably due to the rise of masses of igneous rocks near the surface. The ingenuity of Mr. C. V. Boys has placed a new substance at the disposal of the physicist for the construction of any apparatus requiring the use of fibres. Mr. Boys finds that quartz can by suitable means be melted and drawn out in threads considerably finer than glass, and that these threads possess unusual tenacity, and also perfect elasticity as regards torsion. Cavendish's experiments for measuring the force of gravitation required apparatus with movable arms some six feet long, with leaden masses one foot in diameter; but Mr. Boys was able, by using these delicate quartz fibres, to reduce the size of the apparatus within the most modest dimensions, and to show the mutual attractive force exerted between masses weighing only a few ounces. The strength of these fibres can be judged from the fact that a weight of thirty grams can be carried by a fibre one five-thousandth of an inch in diameter.

Photography has been enriched by the discovery of a new developer. This substance is known as *eikonogen*, and is the sodium salt of one of the numerous naphthol sulphonic acids.

Captain Abney has devised a method by which the intensity of light can be measured by a scale constructed from the density of deposit on a photographic plate. This photographic plate is prepared by exposing, for a gradually increasing time, a negative ruled in small squares along one edge, from a quarter to twenty seconds. The plate is then exposed in the ordinary way, when the squares serve as a scale by which the intensity of the light on various parts of the objects photographed can be determined by a modification of the shadow photometer, in which the two shadows are equalised by the rotation of a disc with an angular aperture, the amount of which can be varied. By this apparatus the absolute photographic intensity of different parts of the spectrum can be determined.

The researches of M. Hirn on the real character of space have but little bearing on applied science, though the results are of the greatest interest in the domain of mathematical physics. M. Hirn comes to the conclusion that matter is not distributed throughout all space, but that certain regions of space are free even from the presence of the ether, whose existence throughout all space has been accepted of late almost as a commonplace of science.

The relations between the phenomena of light and electricity are yearly becoming more intimate. The work of Professor S. P. Thompson on optical torque, and that of Mr. Shelford Bidwell on the action of light on magnetism, have done much to increase our knowledge of their relationship.

CHEMISTRY.

The redetermination of atomic weights has gone on with unabated vigour. The value of the periodic law of Newlands and Mendeléef, in which the properties of an element are directly related to its atomic weight, renders the accurate determination of these constants of great importance. When this law was first enunciated the atomic weights of one-third of the number of known elements were in more or less disagreement with its requirements. These disagreements have one by one been reduced as further investigations were made, but some elements—notably gold and tellurium—have remained as unexplained variations to the law. The atomic weight of gold has been redetermined by Thorpe, and that of tellurium by B. Brauner. The work of Brauner is of the highest importance. He has not only shewn that the atomic weight of this element is less than that of iodine, as Mendeléef's law requires, instead of being greater, as previous experimenters have found, but has furnished substantial evidence that tellurium is not a true element, but a mixture of elements of different atomic weights. The splitting up of the tellurium is accomplished by a process of fractional precipitation similar to that adopted in the case of the rare earths of the yttrium family by Crookes and Marignac. The great theoretical importance of this discovery lies in its bearing on the question of the ultimate composition of the elements. The dissociation of nickel and cobalt by Kruss and Schmidt also deserves mention, though the results are still not generally accepted by chemists. Nickel and cobalt are two metals of the same family, with many similar properties, and are the only two elements of the same atomic weight. From nickel Kruss and Schmidt claim to have extracted a constituent which they call gnomium, though the accuracy of their work has been called in question. The atomic weight of palladium has been redetermined by Dr. E. H. Keiser, who finds, as the result of several series of experiments, a mean value of 106.85, being considerably lower than that obtained by Berzelius and others, and bringing palladium into the position required by the periodic law. Organic chemistry has been enriched by the usual number of new bodies, the names and preparation of which are devoid of interest to all but specialists. It is, however, possible to point out a few of the more important results of these researches, and to show somewhat of their significance. Thus, the derivatives of benzene are studied because many of them occur in nature, forming the substances which give to each plant its special value as a drug, because they contain a ring or closed chain of carbon atoms never less than five or more than six in number, and the reason of this peculiarity is not understood, and because many problems in chemical statics seem best capable of solution by their help. Thus Drs. Skraup and Wiegmann have studied the products of the decomposition of morphine. From this they have obtained an amine containing methyl and ethyl groups. This amine is the last of the isomeric bodies of this composition which remained to be discovered. It has also been rendered probable that as morphine is a derivative of phenanthrene, its real structure will be known when the position of its oxygen atoms is determined, and thus a complicated vegetable alkaloid may be soon prepared artificially.

In fact, the synthesis in the laboratory of bodies previously obtained from animal or vegetable sources only has been carried on with important results. A base of the same composition as quinine, but differing in constitution, has been obtained, and a second isomer will thus be available to assist in unravelling the structure of this valuable substance. An even more interesting synthesis is that of uric acid by Drs. Behrend and Roosen, of Leipzig. This is not strictly speaking new, as uric acid has been previously artificially obtained by fusing urea and glycocine; but this method involves such a high temperature that the structure of the product is rendered doubtful. The method devised by Behrend and Roosen, though more tedious, enables the uric acid to be built up step by step from the urea and aceto-acetic ether, which are the starting points in their process. The result confirms the theory of the constitution of uric acid already advanced by E. Fischer. Another brilliant synthesis is that of formaldehyde from carbon monoxide and hydrogen. Professor Jahn finds that by passing these gases over spongy palladium they unite with each other, molecule to molecule. From formaldehyde Dr. Loew has obtained an artificial glucose by condensation with lime, so that we have an instance of another body similar in composition to the sugars built up artificially from its elements. Among organo-metallic bodies the bismuth derivatives of phenyl deserve mention. Dr. Michaelis finds that bismuth triphenyl crystallises in two different forms, depending upon the conditions under which the crystallisation takes place. As dimorphism of crystals is frequent in nature, instances of the same phenomenon artificially produced help in the discovery of the conditions to which the natural dimorphism is due. Dr. Michaelis finds that the triphenyl, tritolyl, and trixylyl compounds of bismuth readily take up two atoms of chlorine or bromine, so lending support to the pentatomic character of that element, and completing its analogy with arsenic, antimony, and phosphorus, all of which form similar compounds. Another new organo-metallic acid has been recommended as a curious variety of sympathetic ink. This body is an oxalomolybdic acid, discovered by M. Péchard. If a solution of this acid is used for writing on ordinary paper, the characters remain invisible in a weak light, but turn deep indigo if exposed to sunshine. When moistened this colour disappears, but when heated before a fire turns black, and is then permanent. The strongly-smelling methylamine compounds, to which herring-brine owes its powerful odour, have been pressed into service as disinfectants for sewage purposes. The so-called "amnes sewage process" consists essentially in mixing herring-brine with lime, and passing the resulting products into the raw sewage. There appears to be little doubt that, whatever may be the commercial value of the process, these amine derivatives are powerful agents for the purification of sewage. The well-known perchloride of mercury has been used in minute doses with success in the treatment of cholera in Tonquin, and recent researches by Mr. Kingzett show that as an antiseptic it is far superior to any other substance. The usual addition to the number of new explosives has also to be chronicled. In this direction the chief object to be obtained is the preparation of a smokeless powder for military purposes. Experiments have been made with this object both in this country and in Germany. One explosive, called from its rope-like appearance "cordite," has been highly commended by Lord Armstrong; another, "carbonite," has been used with satisfactory results in German coal-mines.

A new process for the manufacture of white lead has been put into practical operation at Glasgow by Mr. J. B. Hannay. Ordinary white lead

is a mixture of carbonate and oxide of lead, produced by the slow action of air and acetic-acid fumes on metallic lead, the manufacture being both tedious and dangerous. By Mr. Hannay's method the sulphate of lead is produced instead of the carbonate, and the manufacture proceeds direct from lead ore, no smelting of the metal being necessary. The lead ore used consists mainly of sulphide of lead. This sulphide is roasted in a current of air, which converts the sulphide into sulphate by the oxygen it contains. The heat employed is sufficient to volatilise the lead sulphate, which is collected in cooling-chambers as a fine impalpable dust. It is claimed for this sulphate that it will fulfil all the purposes of the carbonate, especially as a basis for paints.

BIOLOGY.

Biology has an unusually attractive store of information to present as the results of a year's work. The first place in general interest will probably be given to the report of the Commission appointed by the Nizam of Hyderabad to investigate the action of chloroform. It has been generally admitted that the inhalation of chloroform was attended with special danger when the heart of the patient was in any way affected, and that where fatal results ensued on the administration of chloroform, death was due to stoppage of the heart's action by the drug. The report of the Nizam's Commission, however, directly contradicts these statements. Two sets of experiments were carried out by the members of the Commission. One set dealt with the symptoms observed in animals submitted to the action of chloroform under varying circumstances; in the other set the blood pressure was registered and its variation noted.

Many persons will turn with interest to the researches on bile carried out by Messrs Copeman and Winston at St. Thomas's Hospital. A patient was admitted to the hospital suffering from disease which necessitated the formation of an opening into the gall-bladder. From this opening the bile was collected for several weeks, and experiments were made with this bile. It was found that most of the properties generally attributed to bile were not found in the freshly secreted product. Thus bile has been described as golden-yellow in colour. Dr. Copeman finds that it is deep olive-green, due to a pigment known as biliverdin. The yellow or brownish colour results in the reduction of this biliverdin to bilirubin, a change occurring in the intestine. The flow of bile was found to vary from hour to hour, increasing as a rule after a meal, and was intermittent in character, as the bile ducts forced their contents into the gall-bladder by a series of peristaltic contractions. The total quantity excreted was also larger than has usually been accepted as probable, the flow per diem varying from twenty to forty ounces, the average amount being about four ounces per fourteen pounds of body-weight in the twenty-four hours. The amount of solids in this bile was less than usual, owing probably to the circulation of the bile salts in the system in the case of healthy individuals. The bile was only feebly antiseptic, as organisms of various kinds were grown in bile-impregnated gelatin, in some cases with the same success as in ordinary nutrient jelly; hence, all that can be said is that bile has some retarding effect on ordinary putrefactive processes. As the flow of bile into the alimentary canal was entirely prevented in the case of this patient, the processes of digestion were of course modified. It was found that while fats were only partially digested by the pancreatic juice, proteid materials were digested with apparent completeness; hence bile is necessary for the proper assimilation of fats, but not for that of proteids. The purgative action usually ascribed to the bile is also very doubtful, so that the study of

this case has led to the reversal of several of the most usually accepted characteristics of the bile. Man is usually credited with the possession of only seven pairs of true ribs, but it would seem, from some recent researches by Cunningham, Hyrtl, and others, that an eighth true rib is present more often than has been usually supposed. Professor Cunningham found that this occurred in fourteen out of seventy cases examined, and was more frequently found in man than woman. Dr. Hyrtl of Vienna, however, finds that women present this peculiarity more frequently than men, this being due, according to him, to tight lacing. Dr. Lamb of Washington has noticed similar cases in Indian and negro skeletons, and it may be noted that eight true ribs are found in the chimpanzee. The alarm which has lately been shown in the alleged increase of leprosy may perhaps be diminished by the observations of Dr. C. Q. Jackson on *Bacillus lepræ*, the microbe to which this disease is due. In microscopic character and general morphology this bacillus resembles that of tubercle, from which it differs by being very freely-moving. It was found that animals were inoculable with leprosy only under rare circumstances, and that in man a certain predisposing condition appears to be required before the disease can be communicated to a previously uninfected individual. A disease similar to cholera in man—the so-called chicken cholera—has been investigated by M. Gamaleia. Chicken cholera, due to a bacterium known as *Vibrio Metschnikovi*, cannot be brought on by subcutaneous or intramuscular injections. Like Koch's comma bacillus, it is destroyed by gastric juice, and is therefore not likely to cause disease when swallowed. If, however, the infection is injected into the lungs or trachea of fowls or rabbits, the disease is speedily produced, and it therefore appears likely that cholera infection may take place most readily through the air-passages. The question of infection is also involved in the theory of Metschnikoff that certain elements in the vertebrate—the mesoblastic cells—have the power possessed by the lowest forms of life of absorbing into their substance and digesting organic material. This intracellular digestion is well seen in the amoeba, digestion being extracellular in higher animals. Metschnikoff gives the name of *phagocytes* to those cells which show the power of intracellular digestion, and Hess finds that this phagocytic function is shown by the cells of the splenic parenchyma. Metschnikoff ascribes to these cells the important duty of absorbing and destroying those bacteria which might cause disease, but other observers state that the destruction of these bacteria is chiefly extracellular. In another direction light has been thrown on the processes of digestion by Dr. C. A. MacMunn's researches on biliary and blood pigments, which he has studied by noticing their absorption spectra, and observing the conditions under which one pigment is changed into another.

The causes which produce coagulation of the blood have been investigated by Dr. Haliburton. The coagulation of the blood is, of course, due to the formation of fibrin, but the methods of formation of this fibrin are still rather obscure. The two theories most generally held are those of Schmidt and Hammersten. Schmidt supposes fibrin to be due to the combination of paraglobulin and fibrinogen. Hammersten ascribes the formation of fibrin to the action of a ferment on fibrinogen, this ferment being formed by the disintegration of the white blood-corpuscles. It is this latter theory which the experiments of Dr. Haliburton have materially strengthened; he finds that the ferment is a proteid body, to which he gives the name of cell-globulin. This globulin is one of the disintegration products of lymph-cells, and can be extracted from blood-clot or from the dried alcoholic precipitate of blood

serum. The coagulation of the blood is due to the disintegration of the white blood-corpuscles which liberate this cell-globulin, whose ferment action converts fibrinogen into fibrin; the globulin itself does not become part of the fibrin formed. Cell-globulin resembles other proteids in coagulating by heat. It is precipitated by carbonic acid or by saturated solutions of sulphate of magnesia or soda.

The question of the descent of vertebrates has engaged the attention of a large number of workers. Dr. A. A. Hubrecht has specially studied the embryology of the hedgehog. This animal was selected because it belongs to an order in which the characteristics of the primitive mammalian stock have been most fully retained. Dr. Hubrecht brings forward a large body of important evidence to show that the division of the monodelphous mammals into deciduate and non-deciduate, as based by Huxley on the behaviour of the placenta, cannot be sustained. The relationship of the vertebrate to its invertebrate ancestor is a matter of great intricacy, owing to the difficulty of accounting for the position of the nervous system in the vertebrate. Professor J. Bland Sutton has suggested that the central canal of the vertebrate nervous system—the spinal cord—may be regarded as a modified invertebrate bowel, and Dr. W. H. Gaskell claims to have found in the mammalian brain certain characteristics pointing to its former condition as an alimentary canal. The origin and distribution of the cranial nerves furnish further evidence in this direction. According to his view, the central nervous vertebrate system has been formed by the spreading and increase of nerve-material over the walls of an original non-nervous tube, the cellular elements of this tube being utilised as supporting structures for this nerve-material. The spinal cord thus consisted originally of a bilateral chain of ganglia situated ventrally to a non-nervous tube, the parts of the tube being connected by commissures also situated ventrally to this tube. Professor J. Beard, of the Anatomical Institute of Freiburg, also concludes, from the embryology of the nervous system, that the ancestors of the vertebrates is to be found in some annelid form. The sense-capabilities of various organisms have attracted considerable attention. Professor F. Plateau has noticed that certain blind species of Arthropoda can distinguish light from darkness. Professor Graber confirms the observations of Sir J. Lubbock as to the sensitiveness of ants to the ultra-violet rays. From experiments on earthworms Professor Graber concludes that the general surface of the skin is probably sensitive to light, and that in animals whose skin is more or less semi-transparent the light rays act directly on the nervous system. Other observers have concluded that insects with compound eyes have no sharp perception of form, but that movement is more clearly perceived than shape. The electrical phenomena manifested by the torpedo has been investigated by Professor Fritsch, and those of the skate by Messrs. Sandeman and Gotch. The English observers find that one disc of the electrical organ of the skate is capable of developing an electromotive force equal to $\cdot 02$ of a standard Daniell cell, being slightly less than that which can be obtained from the sartorius muscle of the frog. In the skate the strength of the shock is due to the large number of the discs, which are arranged like a voltaic pile, and so supplied with nerves as to enable them to act simultaneously. A shock can be readily obtained by rubbing the skin. The discharge takes place always towards the tail, and the discharge is reflex in character, the afferent nerves being connected with the spinal cord, and not with the brain.

An interesting experiment was carried out by Professor Fream on the

botanical composition of good meadow land. A plot at the Agricultural College, Downton, was laid down with twenty-five sods, each two feet long, one foot broad, and nine feet deep, from as many selected pastures. When the herbage was cut, the most frequent grasses were perennial rye-grass and common white clover, the rye-grass heading the lists in twenty-one out of the twenty-five cases, in some instances as much as 91 per cent, consisting of this grass, which a few years ago was considered of inferior quality for good permanent pasture. The movement of protoplasm in plants such as *Tradescantia* has never been clearly explained. According to Herr G. Quincke this movement is purely mechanical, being such as is observed when a drop of oil is placed in weak alkali solution during its gradual conversion into a soap. He also finds that a solution of albumen acts similarly to an alkali. This must not, however, be accepted as a full explanation of protoplasmic motion, since Dr. J. Clark finds that alterations in the oxygen pressure modify these movements, which can be completely arrested if this pressure is sufficiently diminished. Among other biological items of interest may be mentioned the completion of Professor O. Bütschli's great work on the Protozoa, on which he has been engaged for ten years; the final completion of the Reports of the *Challenger* expedition; the interesting paper by Dr. C. T. Hudson, President of the Microscopical Society, on the distribution of rotifers, the elaborate monograph on the tunicate mollusc, *Fragaroides aurantiacum*, by M. C. Maurice; and the careful work of Dr. R. Semon on the development of the echinoderm *Synapta digitata*. Finally, it may be recorded, as showing how much zoological work still remains undone, that out of 290 species collected by the Afghan Frontier Delimitation Commission, thirty-two are new.

GEOLOGY.

The great geological map of France has been completed. This important work was begun seven years ago, and is drawn on a scale of 1-500,000, or about 2½ miles to an inch. The colouring adopted is that recommended by the Geological Congress held at Bologna in 1881, in which the order of colours in the spectrum correspond in regular sequence with the age of different strata, the violet being applied to rocks older than those to which blue is allotted, green being still newer, and so on. This arrangement suffices for all the mesozoic and caenozoic formations, the paleozoic and volcanic rocks being differently treated. Two English publications of our own Geological Survey are worthy to rank with this great French work. The main results of the survey in the north-western Highlands of Scotland have been already given to the public, but the full volume of evidence now published will show clearly that these results are based on an ample array of facts. The enormous lateral movements some of these rocks have undergone, involving change in position of many miles, and the thrust of enormous rock masses over each other, have now received sufficient confirmation to be accepted as the adequate causes for the formation of these mountains. But in addition to the explanation of this process of mountain-building, the report is full of evidence of the connection between these great terrestrial movements and the metamorphic changes which the rocks themselves have undergone. Mr. Whitaker's two volumes on the geology of the London district also contain large stores of carefully collected facts in aid of what to many persons will be the most vitally interesting question of modern geology, viz., Is coal to be found at a workable depth near London? The presence of rolled fragments of anthracite has been previously reported, and Mr. Whitaker,

from these and other data, concludes that coal, possibly of the anthracitic or smokeless variety, may yet be profitably worked within the area of the London basin. Another English observer, the Rev. R. Baron, has done much useful geological work in the island of Madagascar. It is of interest to note that many common British fossils were found there in rocks of similar character to those in this country. Professor A. H. Green has dealt with the geology of South Africa, and the conclusions to which he arrives as to the age of certain disputed strata, the so-called Karroo beds, have been independently confirmed by Dr. A. Schenk, both geologists adopting practically the same arrangement for the various sedimentary formations. In much smaller areas good work has been done by many local geologists. Then the subdivisions of the Speeton clay of Yorkshire have been carefully described by Mr. G. W. Lamplugh. The Jurassic clays of Lincolnshire have been studied by Mr. T. Roberts, while Mr. S. S. Buckman has investigated the Cotteswold, Midford, and Yeovil sands in the south-west of England. The vexed question of the antiquity of man has been brought one step nearer solution by the work of the veteran geologist Dr. Prestwich on the flint implements found at Ightham, Kent, and its neighbourhood. Since these flint implements were made, the courses of the river valleys have so altered that in some instances the present water-sheds cut right across the line of flow of former streams, these streams being, of course, at a much higher level than at the present day. Dr. Prestwich considers that man in this district was probably pre-glacial, but that the time which has elapsed since this glacial epoch is less than has been generally admitted.

Mineralogists and chemists have had cause for rejoicing in the numerous discoveries of rare minerals. A lode containing uranium mineral has been found in Cornwall, and promptly exploited by a mining company; while in Llano county, Texas, splendid blocks of gadolinite and fergusonite have been found from ten to forty pounds in weight, and containing up to 50 per cent. of the rare metals thorium, uranium, and yttrium. Three of the minerals found are new, and have received the names of thoro-gummite, yttrialite, and nivenite. Mr. Sperry, of Ontario, has described another new mineral of great theoretical interest. This is a compound of platinum and arsenic, and is the first instance in which platinum has been found combined with any other element—except as an alloy with metals like itself, such as iridium or osmium. This arsenide of platinum is found as a heavy crystalline sand, manifesting a peculiar resistance to wetting with water. In crystalline form it is allied to iron pyrites.

The mode of formation of the volcanic rocks has continued to engage the attention of M. Renaud, whose experiments are throwing great light on this obscure subject. A new classification of the pre-Cambrian rocks has been proposed by Professor J. F. Blake. These rocks have previously been almost unclassified, and but few attempts have been made to correlate them in the various areas in which they occur. Professor Blake proposes the term *Monian* to include a series of rocks older than the Cambrian, most of them sedimentary in character, and some of them possibly fossiliferous. The Cambrian fossils known as Archæocyathus have been studied by Dr. G. J. Hinde. He finds that this name has been applied to several distinct organisms. One of these is a true silicious sponge, and comes from a formation known to the Canadian geologists as representing the upper division of the Cambrian system. Most of the Archæocyathus would, however, be considered by Dr. Hinde as allied to the perforate corals, and as the Archæocya-

thus is found in the lowest fossiliferous zone of the Cambrian, this would put the age of coral much earlier than has been previously considered probable. Another Cambrian fossil, *Olenellus*, has been detected in the Shropshire rocks round the Wrekin. An *Olenellus* zone has been already noted in the earliest strata of Cambrian age in North America, Norway, and Lapland. As this *Olenellus* bed in Shropshire rests unconformably upon the so-called Uriconian beds of the Wrekin, the pre-Cambrian age of these rocks is rendered almost certain. A new reptile, allied to the genus *Sphenodon*, still living in New Zealand, and named *Palæohatteria*, has been found in the Permian rocks near Dresden; and some specimens of fossils from the Jurassic strata of Bavaria, examined by Mr. F. A. Bathe, have been found to be representatives of a remarkable genus of Crinoids, in which only three of the five rays are left. The first indications of lake-dwellings in the New World have been found by Mr. H. B. Cresson, of Philadelphia. At the mouth of a small tributary of the Delaware piles resembling those found in Switzerland have been discovered, with stone implements, bones, human teeth, and in one place specimens of rude pottery. The coral-reef controversy has been advanced another step towards solution by Dr. Guppy. Dr. Guppy states, from the results of his observation of Keeling Island, that atolls of this shape are practically flat mountain-tops: that the central lagoon is so shallow that the atoll can only be properly described as a flat reef slightly raised at the edges; and that the crescent form of this and similar atolls is given after the island has been thrown up by the waves. The wash of the wave is, Dr. Guppy thinks, sufficient to cause the slightly raised rim already mentioned, the crescentic form being caused by the wash of sand and *débris* by a more or less constant surface current, towards which the original small island faced. The record of geology may be closed by the mention of an earthquake which was felt in districts round the English Channel on April 80.

ASTRONOMY.

The past year has seen two total eclipses of the sun. On January 1 the line of totality crossed part of the North American continent, and full advantage of this was taken by the astronomers of the United States. Thus the Harvard observers stationed at Willow, California, secured between fifty and sixty photographs, of which eight were taken by the 13-inch telescope specially arranged to photograph the corona, five negatives being devoted to the search for an intra-mercurial planet, while twenty were taken of the spectrum. The corona bore a striking resemblance to those of 1867 and 1878, consisting of long equatorial streamers, with much detail near the poles. Other photographs of the corona were obtained by Professor Keeler, of the Lick Observatory. All drawings and photographs on the line of totality from the Pacific Coast to Manitoba agree in showing that the corona was one of marked proportions and irregularity of figure. The great similarity between the coronal appearance now and in 1878 and 1867—intervals of eleven years—suggests a connection between the corona and the sun spots, all these dates being periods of minimum sun spots. There was considerable divergence from each other of the coronal rays at a distance from the sun, such as would be the case if the rays were similarly electrified. The sun is still near its period of minimum activity as regards sun spots, the southern hemisphere still showing more than the northern. In this connection Professor Spörer has recently called attention to the circumstance that past observations, instead of showing an average between the number of spots in the northern and

southern hemispheres, tend to the conclusion that from some undetermined cause the northern hemisphere is less favoured in this respect than the southern. Mr. Isaac Roberts has taken a number of photographs of various nebulae, which have revealed many new details of the structure of these bodies. Thus, in the Andromeda nebula, as previously drawn, there appears two straight dark lines or rifts, of which no satisfactory explanation could be given. In the photograph these rifts are shown as part of a dark central ring, so that the nebula seems to be a helix of bright matter in a plane inclined to the line of sight. This photograph shows several other points which tend to confirm the nebular hypothesis of Laplace. For instance, the parent nebula seems to have thrown off ring after ring, while apparently two satellites at least are in process of formation. At a lecture delivered by Professor G. H. Darwin before the Royal Institution special reference was made to these facts, and to the significance of recent photographic work, as shown by the number of stars rendered visible by this means. Thus, if the whole heavens were as thickly studded with stars as on Mr. Roberts's photograph of Cygnus, there would be at least 170,000,000 systems of greater importance than the one of which the earth is a member. Among the nebulae photographed by Mr. Roberts are Messier 81 and 82, a nebulous star in Ursa Major, M 5 Canum Venaticorum, M 31 Andromeda. The general result of these photographs is to confirm the idea that in these nebulae we see possible solar systems in various stages of evolution, some being comparatively newly formed, while others are in much later stages of growth.

Professor Holder has made some useful experiments on the structure of spiral nebulae by means of artificial helices, so constructed as to give on projection the appearance seen in these nebulae when photographed. Thus one type of helix, orthogonally projected, gives essentially all the spiral nebulae in Lassell's drawings and in those of Lord Rosse.

One of the new comets of 1889, that discovered by Mr. Brooks on July 7, is of very great interest. It is a comet of small period, the time of revolution round the sun being estimated as not more than seven or eight years.

Mr. Barnard found that this comet (A) was attended by four companions, which he calls respectively B, C, D, and E. Of these, D and E soon became too faint for further notice, but frequent measurements were taken of B and C. They were found to be separating from A quite rapidly, C doing so faster than B till the end of August, when B ceased to recede and underwent a remarkable change, enlarging and becoming diffused, without any trace of central condensation. It ultimately disappeared, after showing traces of orbital motion round A. In the meantime C continued to recede, increasing at the same time in size and brilliancy till it was brighter than A. In September the receding motion gradually ceased, and finally changed into a slow motion of approach to A, while it became enlarged by diffusion similarly to B. It was hoped that measures of the relative positions of these bodies may detect some orbital motion of the smaller bodies round the larger. Should this orbital motion be detected, the mass of the comet could be determined—a question which has never yet been solved in the case of any comet. The phenomena presented by this comet are exceedingly rare. The best known case is that of the Biela comet in 1845 and of the great comet of 1882, but in these cases the companion comets did not present the variety of appearance shown by this comet. Four other comets were discovered during the year. One of these, first observed by Mr. Davidson at Melbourne, on July 21, was easily observable by telescopes of 2-inch aperture. On July 30 it was

successfully photographed by Mr. Barnard at the Lick Observatory. The comet was found to possess a wide fan-shaped tail, tolerably bright for a distance of 20' from its head, but traceable for a further distance of 30'. The motion of Winnecke's comet has been investigated by Dr. Haerdtl. He finds that there is no increase in the mean motion of the comet, and hence no evidence that it encounters a "resisting medium" in its passage through space. From a comparison of the results of stellar parallax obtained during the past fifty years, Dr. Oudemans concludes that the annual parallax is smallest in stars of which the proper motion is the least. Dr. Chandler, from a study of variable stars, finds that the number of variables with periods of a year are much larger than would have been expected considering the far less likelihood of the variation being detected in these cases.⁹ He includes in short-period variables those stars with periods of less than ninety days, and in long-period variables those exceeding 120 days. No stars at present observed have shown a period between ninety and 120 days. The asteroids No. 12 Victoria and No. 80 Sappho have been observed with great diligence at the Cape University by Dr. Gill. Sappho was in a very favourable position for observation. Six more of these bodies have been added to the list, making a grand total of 287. Seventy of these are credited to Professor Palisa. As the last discovered (No. 287) is of the tenth magnitude, there are probably some more of the brighter asteroids still awaiting discovery.

Mr. Gore has published, in the Monthly Notices of the Astronomical Society, the results he has calculated for the orbit of the companion of Sirius. This companion, which is at present within five seconds of arc of its brilliant primary, is now invisible in any but the largest telescopes. The companion will attain its nearest position to Sirius in 1896, and the total time taken for one revolution round its primary is computed by Mr. Gore to be $58\frac{1}{2}$ years. The eccentricity of this orbit is also given by Mr. Gore as about 0.4. In the southern hemisphere Professor Ellery has been examining stars at Melbourne with a direct-vision spectroscope, preliminary to a more thorough spectroscopic examination with his 4-foot reflector.

M. Ch. Montigny, of Brussels, has made some interesting observations on the twinkling of stars. He finds that this scintillation not only varies with the season and the state of the atmosphere, being greater in winter than in summer and in bad than in good weather, but that northern stars always exceed the others in frequency. Dr. Pernter, of the Vienna Academy of Science, finds that there is more scintillation at the summit of a mountain 10,000 feet high than at the foot, the star observed being Sirius. From these Dr. Pernter concludes that the phenomenon takes place high up in the atmosphere. The Eiffel Tower has also been pressed into the service of astronomical physics. M. Janssen has made a series of observations on the electric light on the top of this tower, as seen at the Observatory of Meudon, five miles distant. The stratum of air through which the light would then pass is estimated to be about equal to that which the sun's light passes through when the sun is at the zenith, and M. Janssen concludes from his experiments that the absorption-bands of oxygen seen in the sun's spectrum are really due to the atmosphere, and by no means show the presence of that element in the sun itself. The year ended as it began, with a total eclipse of the sun along a line drawn through the Caribbean Sea, St. Helena, and Africa. The eclipse was observed with success in several places, but the attempt has cost the life of the Rev. Father Perry, who fell a victim to fever soon after his arrival at his post of observation.

The planet Saturn received particular attention, owing to the announcement in March by Dr. Terby that he had detected a white spot on one of the rings. Some observers failed to recognise this spot at all, and the general conclusion was that anything of the kind was due to contrast, and this opinion was rendered almost certain by some ingenious experiments by Mr. Schaeberle. Several valuable memoirs on the planet Jupiter have been published. Among them may be mentioned Mr. N. E. Green's paper on the belts and markings of Jupiter; the drawings made by Dr. Boeddicker, at Parsonstown, during the years 1881 to 1886; and the work of Mr. S. Williams on the light and dark spots on the planet. Mr. Williams differs from most previous observers in placing the white spots lower down in the atmosphere of Jupiter than the dark spots—a difficult view to accept. For spots in the neighbourhood of the equator Mr. Williams gives a rotation period of 9 hours 50½ minutes. On the evening of August 7 the occultation of Jupiter by the moon occurred. The presence of a dark band on the planet was remarked by some of the observers. This was also noticed in the case of the occultation in 1857. At the moment of emergence Jupiter presented a dull ashy appearance, which gradually brightened as the planet moved away from the moon's limb. At Mr. Common's observatory at Ealing Mr. Taylor has detected certain faint stars, which may be new satellites of the planet Uranus. The spectrum of this planet is also said to show certain bright flutings which would be due to a certain intrinsic luminosity of the planet.

On the morning of September 20 occurred the closest conjunction of the planets Mars and Saturn which has been recorded. This conjunction was within forty-eight minutes of Regulus (α Leonis).

The Harvard College Observatory has been enriched by a gift of the money by Miss Bruce, of New York, for the purchase of a new telescope specially adapted for photographic purposes. This instrument is to have an object-glass of twenty-four inches clear aperture, constructed like a photographic doublet lens, with a focal length of eleven feet. Professor Pickering hopes, with its help, to completely photograph the northern hemisphere. The Pulkowa Observatory has celebrated its jubilee. The occasion was signalled by the completion of Dr. Oudemans' work on stellar parallax, in which he has incorporated the observations and results made by different observers during the past sixty years. Cambridge has received, and accepted, the offer of a large equatorial telescope of twenty-five inches aperture, belonging to the late Mr. R. S. Newall. The Astrophotographic Conference has drawn up a series of regulations, under which the photographic mapping of the heavens is to be made, and has provisionally allotted the area to be surveyed by each of the observatories which have agreed to assist in the work. All stars down to the 11th magnitude are to be included; the photographs are to be so taken that the edges of contiguous places will overlap by an amount equal to 5' of arc, and the centre of the place is to be within 5'' of the point in the heavens at which the telescope is directed. The preparation of the plates and the developer to be used has been for the present left undecided, while experiments are being made to determine the best formula for this special kind of photographic work. Finally, in the borderland between astronomy and geography, the publication of the measurements of the new French meridian deserve notice. The mean value, which has been determined with great accuracy, agrees within $\frac{1}{100000}$ of those obtained from the English, Belgian, Spanish, and Italian triangulations.

GEOGRAPHY.

Of all the daring explorations of which Africa has been the scene, none has equalled that which Mr. Stanley has just brought to a successful end. The Emin Pasha Relief Expedition was first organised in 1886. Early in 1887 Mr. Stanley started for Africa, and by the end of April had reached Stanley Pool. In another month he had reached Yambuya, on the Aruwimi, a tributary of the Congo. There he constructed a fortified camp, which he left in charge of Major Barttelot. On June 10, 1887, Stanley left Yambuya for the southern end of the Albert Nyanza, and for six months toiled through pathless forests and among hostile tribes, not reaching the lake till the end of the year. The forest district stretched in one unbroken line for nearly 1,000 miles; the ground was often little better than a swamp, and losses by fever were severe. After meeting Emin, Stanley retraced his steps to the camp at the Aruwimi, only to find on reaching it that Major Barttelot had been killed and the majority of his force scattered. Towards the end of January in the past year Stanley had, however, again reached the Albert Nyanza; in little more than two months a start was finally made for the coast, and on December 4 Stanley and Emin arrived at Bagamoyo, after nearly three years' wandering in Central Africa, much of it over ground never previously explored. The geographical results of this wonderful journey are at present scarcely all known. Mr. Stanley has discovered another lofty range of mountains, rivalling in height Kilimanjaro, he has traced the Semliki to its source in a lake, which he has named Lake Albert Edward, and has extended the known area of the Victoria Nyanza much further to the southwest. Mr. F. C. Selous has explored the Kafukwe River, a tributary of the Zambesi. In the country between the two rivers he was attacked by the Mashukulumbwe and the rebel Marotse, losing all his property and barely escaping with his life. A new mouth of the Zambesi, the Chindé, has been explored. It has a mean depth of three fathoms, and its channel is on an average 500 yards wide. It opens into the Indian Ocean forty-five miles south of Quilmane. A survey of the proposed railway from Vivi to Stanley Pool on the Congo river has been completed. The course selected for the line lies on the west side of the river as far as Matadi, and then turns inland in order to avoid crossing some large tributaries of the Congo. The latest advices from the Congo Free State do not, however, encourage the hope that this railway will soon be carried out, as the affairs of the new State appear to be drifting into confusion. In Eastern Africa Mr. J. R. W. Pigott has traced the river Tana to within a short distance of Mount Kenia, through a region most of which was almost uninhabited, and then returned southwards to Mombasa by a route previously almost unexplored by Europeans, while Dr. Hans Meyer has, in the same district, started to ascend both Kenia and Kilimanjaro, which, with the Ruwenzori just discovered by Stanley, are the highest mountains in Africa.

Asia.—Colonel R. G. Woodthorpe, R.E., has explored some of the upper reaches of the Chindwin River, which rises in the hill ranges near the source of the Brahmaputra, in the district between Assam and Burma, and finally joins the Irawadi in Upper Burma. One of the largest feeders of the Chindwin is the river Yu. This river drains the Kubo Valley by two branches, meeting each other from opposite directions, and then turning at right angles through a narrow gorge between lofty mountains into the Chindwin Valley. The observations were greatly retarded by jungle fires, said to be caused in

the dry season by rocks rolling down the hill-sides striking against others, and in so doing throwing off sparks which set fire to the parched vegetation. Altogether an area of 2,800 square miles was triangulated; 860 square miles of the Manipur Valley were surveyed on a scale of two miles to an inch, together with the whole of the Kobu Valley.

The mountains of the Caucasus nearly claimed some more noted victims in the persons of Baron Ungern Sternberg and M. Golombievsky. These two explorers spent sixteen hours on the ridge between the two peaks of Mount Elburz, at an elevation of 17,840 feet, during a fearful snowstorm, which rendered a descent impossible. After being nearly killed by the exposure, they were enabled to return in safety, having made the longest stay at such an altitude, with the exception of that by M. Vallot on the top of Mont Blanc reported last year. Another Russian explorer started in the spring of 1888 from Turkestan with the object of crossing the Pamir to Dardistan and the Upper Indus, a journey which has already been successfully undertaken by Dr. Jos. Troll, while the work of exploration cut short by the lamented death of Colonel Prjevalsky has been taken up by Colonel Pyrtsof, who, after wintering at Nia, to the east of Khotan, has started to cross the mountain range dividing Russian territory from Thibet. Other attempts to penetrate into Thibet have been made by Mr. W. W. Rockhill, who, after a most interesting journey, was stopped and turned back before reaching Lhasa, and by M. J. Martin, who has started from Pekin, and by M. Nolowich, who is following in Colonel Pyrtsof's track from Eastern Turkestan. British explorers have also plenty of good work to show in Asia. Colonel M. S. Bell has, after seven years' work, explored most of the passes leading from Southern to Northern Asia, from Armenia on the west to Eastern China. Captain Durand, the British Resident at Gilgat, has surveyed some of the passes of the Hindu Khoosh, and Lieut. Younghusband has continued his valuable work in the same region. In further India Captain Cupet has opened up a road between the Upper Mekong and Annam, and a steamer has navigated the Red River up to the frontier of the Chinese province of Yunnan. Russian colonisation in the Syr Daria, which was first commenced in the east of Lake Aral in 1875, is reported to be making good progress; but the attempt to open up a trade route to the Yenesei River in Siberia proved a failure, as Captain Wiggins was unable to reach his destination owing to the ice barring his passage.

America.—Captain John Page explored the Bermejo in the Argentine Republic. The river is most erratic in character: at one place, where only nine inches of water were found in ascending the river, twelve feet were sounded in returning, without any rise due to flood. A second ascent was made to save the garrison on the upper reaches of the river, which were threatened with drowning owing to the sudden rise of the water. In British Columbia, the Rev. W. S. Green has explored some of the glaciers in the Selkirk, and has mapped some of the great glaciers which lie around the source of the Illecillewaet River. The geological character of the Selkirk leads him to think that they, and not the Canadian Rockies, are the line of continuation of the Montana Rocky Mountains.

Australasia.—Dr. H. Zoller made some explorations in German New Guinea, spending four weeks in the interior, ascending the Finisterre range of mountains to an altitude of 9,000 feet, and discovering a new chain, named by him the Krätke, between the Finisterre and Bismarck ranges, ascending to the height of about 10,000 feet.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED, IN 1889.¹

JANUARY.

James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps, F.R.S., who died on Jan. 3, at his residence, Hallingbury Copse, Brighton, was a son of Mr. Thomas Halliwell, of Sloane Street, Chelsea, where he was born on June 21, 1820. He received his early education under Mr. Charles Butler, author of "The Introduction to the Mathematics." At an early age he devoted himself to antiquarian researches, chiefly directing his attention to the literary history and antiquities of this country as embodied in the various early works of prose and verse. Many rare and curious works on these and cognate subjects were brought out under his supervision, and his name became favourably known to Shakespearean scholars as that of the author of more than twenty original papers and elaborate works on the writings of the great dramatist. His principal works were a "Life of Shakespeare," 1848; a sumptuous edition of the works of Shakespeare, with a revised biography, published by subscription in sixteen folio volumes, 1858-65; a "Calendar of the Records of Stratford-on-Avon," 1863; a "History of New Place," 1864; and "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare." He was mainly instrumental in the purchase of the poet's estate of New Place for the Corporation of Stratford-on-Avon, and in the formation of the Shakespeare Museum of that town. He assumed the name of Phillipps by Royal licence in 1872, under a direction in the will of the late Mr. Thomas Phillipps, of Broadway, the grandfather of his first wife.

Francis Hueffer, who died at Bush Green, Hammersmith, on Jan. 19, was born at Munster in 1848, the son of a banker, and passed most of his youth in Germany, but came to England in 1869.

After studying music and philology in London, Paris, Berlin, and Leipzig, he published, at the age of 24, a critical edition of the works of Guillem de Cabestanh, a twelfth-century troubadour, for which he received the degree of Ph.D. from Göttingen University. His more ambitious work on "The Troubadours: a history of Provençal Life and Literature in the Middle Ages," was published nine years later, in 1878; and in 1880 he returned to the subject in his lectures on the Troubadours at the Royal Institution. A great admirer of Richard Wagner, Dr. Hueffer was perhaps the first in England to recognise his merit and to advocate his claims. "Richard Wagner, and the Music of the Future," appeared in 1874, when Wagner was little appreciated in this country; and a more complete biography followed in 1881. "Musical Studies," reprinted from periodicals in 1880, were translated into Italian and were published at Milan in 1888. In the same year (1888) he published "Italian and other Studies," and wrote for the English Opera at Drury Lane the libretto of a drama, "Colomba," the music of which was by Mr. A. C. Mackenzie. In 1887, also in conjunction with Mr. Mackenzie, he produced a second opera, entitled "The Troubadour," with Guillem de Cabestanh as its hero; and this was favourably received on its performance at Drury Lane. He was also the author of the articles on Beethoven, Handel, and other eminent musicians in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Dr. Hueffer married, in 1872, Cathy, younger daughter of Mr. Ford Madox Brown, the historical painter.

The Most Hon. and Very Rev. Edward Chichester, fourth Marquess and ninth Earl of Donegall, Earl of Belfast (1791), Viscount Chichester

¹ These notices are in several cases adapted from the *Times*.

1625), Baron Chichester of Belfast (1612)—all in the peerage of Ireland—and Baron Fishervick of Fishervick, in that of the United Kingdom (1790), died at St. Leonards-on-Sea on Jan. 20. The head of the Irish branch of the ancient house of Chichester, he was born June 11, 1799, the second son of George Augustus, second Marquess of Donegall, K.P., and succeeded to the marquise on the death of his brother, Oct. 20, 1883. He was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated B.A. in 1822, and entered Holy Orders. He became B.P. and D.D. in 1852, and was Dean of Raphoe from 1832 to 1873. He married, Sept. 21, 1821, Amelia Spread Deane, third daughter of Mr. Henry Deane Grady, of Lodge, in the county of Limerick, and Stillorgan Castle, in the county of Dublin, leaving, with two other sons and two daughters, an eldest son, George Augustus Hamilton, Earl of Belfast, now fifth Marquess of Donegall, born June 27, 1822, and married Aug. 31, 1865, Mary Ann Williams, youngest daughter of Mr. Edward Cobb, of Arnold, in the county of Kent.

The Right Rev. Joshua Hughes, D.D., Bishop of St. Asaph, died at Crieff, on Jan. 21, after a lingering illness. He was born in 1807, the son of Mr. C. Hughes, of Newport, in the county of Pembroke; was educated at St. David's College, Lampeter, where he graduated first class in final examination; and was successively Minister of St. David's, Carmarthen; Vicar of Abergwili and of Llandoverly; Rural Dean, Surrogate, and Proctor in Convocation for the diocese of St. David's. He was consecrated Bishop of St. Asaph in 1870. He married, in 1832, Margaret, daughter of Sir Thomas McKenny, first Baronet of Ullard and Mount Rothe, in the county of Kilkenny, and widow of Captain William Gun, leaving, amongst others, his eldest son, Thomas McKenny, Professor of Geology at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Sir George Clendining O'Donel, fifth Baronet, of Newport House, in the county of Mayo, died on Jan. 22, at Norwood, leaving no issue. He was born June 15, 1832, the elder son of Sir Richard Annesley O'Donel, fourth Baronet (whose grandfather was created a Baronet of Ireland, Dec. 2, 1780), by Mary, his wife, third daughter of Mr. George Clendining, of Westport, and succeeded his brother, Nov. 9, 1878. He was formerly Lieutenant in the 62nd

Foot, was a Justice of the Peace and Deputy Lieutenant for Mayo, and served the office of High Sheriff for that county in 1857. As the eldest son of a baronet he was gazetted a Knight (K.B.) in the same year. In 1865 he married (June 29) Mary Stratford, only surviving daughter of the late Mr. Euseby Stratford Kirwan, of Bawn House, in the county of Longford.

Sir Henry William Dashwood, fifth Baronet, of Kirtlington Park, in the county of Oxford, whose death at his seat took place on Jan. 25, was born Oct. 17, 1816. He was the eldest son of Sir George Dashwood, fourth Baronet, by Marianne Sarah, his wife, eldest daughter of Sir William Rowley, second Baronet, of Tendring Hall, in the county of Suffolk; was educated at Harrow and at Oxford University, and succeeded to the title on his father's death, Sept. 22, 1861. He was formerly Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of Oxfordshire, of which county he served the office of High Sheriff in 1867. He contested unsuccessfully Oxford, in the Liberal interest, in 1861. Sir Henry Dashwood, whose baronetcy was created Sept. 16, 1684, married, Sept. 18, 1845, Sophia, only child of John Drinkwater, of Sherborne House, in the county of Warwick.

Archduke Rudolph of Austria.—The Archduke Rudolph Francis Charles Joseph, Prince Imperial of Austria and Prince Royal of Hungary and Bohemia, whose life closed so tragically at the Shooting Lodge of Mayerling on Jan. 30, was the second child and only son of Francis Joseph I., by his wife Elizabeth Amélie Eugénie, daughter of Maximilian, Duke in Bavaria. The Crown Prince was born on Aug. 21, 1858, and was married May 10, 1881, to the Princess Stéphanie, second daughter of the King of the Belgians. The Crown Prince was an accomplished linguist and was devoted to sport, to which he also applied his scientific attainments. He hunted all along the course of the Danube, studying the peculiarities of the various wild animals he there encountered. He wrote a book on the bears of Transylvania, the chamois of Styria, and the deer of Lower Austria. More recently, however, he had taken up his military duties with great ardour, and had been appointed Inspector-General of Infantry. His health, never very strong, had, however, been seriously compromised by his manner of life, and that, combined with the keen disappointment he felt at

having no son, apparently told upon his mind. For some time, at all events, since the death of King Ludwig of Bavaria (June 1886), the idea of suicide had been constantly present to him. He had, moreover, formed an unfortunate attachment to the daughter of an Hungarian Baroness, a young girl of great beauty. By arrangement she left her mother's house and drove to the Crown Prince's shooting lodge, apparently with the intention of carrying out their de-

termination to die together. The Crown Prince, after having got rid of his only companions, Prince Philip of Coburg and Count Hoyos, retired to his room, where he spent some hours in writing letters. Early the following morning his valet, on entering the room, found two dead bodies, the Baroness having taken strychnine, and the Crown Prince shot himself through the head with a pistol.

During the same month we have to record the following deaths:—On the 1st, at Brighton, aged 86, **Harriet, Dowager Countess of Sheffield**, elder daughter of second Earl of Harewood; married, 1825, second Earl of Sheffield. On the 2nd, at Newnham, Cambridge, aged 65, the Rev. **Stephen Parkinson, D.D., F.R.S.**, many years Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, and author of treatises on mechanics and optics. On the 4th, at Woolwich, aged 77, **Major-General Hugh Manly Tuite**, Royal Artillery, the second son of Sir George Tuite, ninth Baronet, of Sonna, in the county of Westmeath, by Janet, his wife, daughter of Major Thomas Woodall, 12th Regiment. He entered the Army in 1860, and retired as Major-General in 1859. On the 5th, at Franklyn's, Hayward's Heath, aged 68, **Rear-Admiral the Hon. Thomas Alexander Pakenham**, third son of second Earl of Longford. He entered the Royal Navy in 1834, served in the Crimea, a Rear-Admiral on Retired List 1878, married, 1853, Sophia F., daughter of Sir Tatton Sykes, fourth Baronet. On the 7th, in Brompton, aged 84, **Mary Ann Swanborough**, many years manageress of the Strand Theatre. On the same date, at Brighton, aged 56, **Major the Hon. Charles Keith-Falconer**, the third son of the seventh Earl of Kintore, born in 1832. After a short stay at Eton, he entered the Navy, where in 1847, whilst attacking some Arab slavers on the east coast of Africa, he was wounded. He then entered the Army and joined the 4th Hussars. He served with distinction in the Crimea, 1854-5, where he obtained the medal with two clasps, Turkish and Sardinian medals, and fifth class Medjidieh. In 1874 he was appointed Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and this office he held to the time of his death. On the 8th, aged 69, the Rev. **Francis Thomas Crosse, D.C.L.**, Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Chichester Cathedral, and for thirty-one years Incumbent of Trinity Church, Hastings, where he was Rural Dean. He was also a member of the Inner Temple, having been admitted as a barrister in 1846. On the 9th, at Mulgrave House, Sutton, aged 80, **Sir Thomas Scambler Owden Knight, F.R.G.S.**, Alderman of Bishopsgate Ward. He was the youngest and only surviving son of Mr. John Owden, of Cuckfield, in the county of Sussex, by Anne, his wife, daughter of Mr. Thomas Scambler. He entered the Corporation in 1847, and was first a representative of the Bishopsgate Ward in the Court of Common Council and afterwards (1862) a Deputy. He was made an Alderman in 1868, served the office of Sheriff of London and Middlesex 1870-1, and was Lord Mayor of London 1877-78. In the latter year he received the honour of knighthood. He married, in 1837, Frances Mary, eldest daughter of Mr. John Rugby. On the 10th, at Knapton House, North Walsham, aged 70, **Lucy, Lady Robinson**, widow of Sir Henry Robinson, Lieutenant Gentleman-at-Arms (died 1879), and daughter of W. D. Cooper Cooper, of Toddington Manor, Bedfordshire. On the same date, at Cuckfield Rectory, aged 67, the Rev. **Churchill Babington, D.D., F.L.S.**, Honorary Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, a botanist of high repute. Also on the same date, at Rome, aged 79, **Father Alessandro Gavazzi**, originally a member of the Order of the Barnabites. At the time of the reactionary movement of Pope Pius IX. he became known as an anti-Popery lecturer and controversialist, and made lecturing tours in England to collect funds for the Italian Free Church. On the 13th, in Dublin, aged 60, **William Maunsell Hennessy**, Deputy Keeper of the Records in Ireland, one of the most distinguished of Celtic scholars. Born at Castlegregory, in the county of Kerry, by his learning and ability he worked his way to a foremost place among the *literati* of his time. He edited for the Rolls series the "Chronicon Scotorum" and "The Annals of Loch Key," as well as "The Annals of Ulster," on which he was engaged at the period of his death. On the same date, at Folkestone, aged 78, **Sir Henry Arthur Hunt, C.B.**, late Consulting Surveyor to Her Majesty's Office of Works, and Auditor for the Dean and Chapter of West-

minster. He was the son of James Hunt, of Westminster, and became a member of the firm of surveyors, Hunt, Stephenson, and Jones. He was knighted in 1876. Also on the same date, at Wilbraham Temple, Cambridge, aged 74, **Edward Hicks**, son of Edward Simpson, of Lichfield. Educated at Charter House and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, married, 1838, Grace, eldest daughter of Stanley Pipe Wolfenstan, of Stafford, Staffordshire; assumed the name of Hicks. High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire 1862, and sat as a Conservative for the county 1879-85, and was for many years Vice-Chairman of Quarter Sessions. On the 14th, at Hampstead, aged 76, **John Moore Capes, M.A.**, at one time a prominent clergyman of the Church of England, and subsequently a convert to the Church of Rome. On the 16th Lieutenant-Colonel **John Augustus Conolly, V.C.**, Resident Magistrate of the Curragh district. He entered the 49th Regiment, from which he retired in 1863. He served in the Eastern Campaign of 1854, including the battle of the Alma and the siege of Sebastopol (mentioned in despatches, medal with two clasps, Victoria Cross, Sardinian and Turkish medals, and Fifth Class of the Medjidieh). On the 20th, in Onslow Square, S.W., aged 69, **Henry Philip Archibald Buchanan Riddell, C.S.I.**, of Whitefield House, Northumberland, of the Bengal Civil Service, and some time a member of the Legislative Council of India and Director of the Indian Post Office. He was the son of Sir John Buchanan Riddell, ninth Baronet. On the 22nd, in Mortimer Street, aged 50, **Carlo Pellerini**, an artist who under the signature of "Ape" was well known as a caricaturist of English society. A Neapolitan by birth, he had thrown himself into the political struggles of his time, and exiled himself from his country and settled in England. His caricatures, chiefly for "Vanity Fair," extended over a period of twenty years. On the 23rd, aged 65, **Alexandre Cabanel**, a distinguished French painter. On the same date, aged 47, Lieutenant-Colonel **Francis James Baker**, of Ballinrover, county Waterford. He entered the Army in the Anglesey Light Infantry, and thence passed into the Ceylon Rifles, but he acquired his chief distinction in South Africa as the founder and Commander of Baker's Horse. On the 25th, in Upper Brook Street, aged 83, **R. Stewart Menzies**, of Hallyburton, Coupar Angus, N.B., eldest son of Graham Menzies, of Edinburgh, and his wife, daughter of the late Mr. William Dudgeon, of Edinburgh, was educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1830; was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1832; and was a magistrate of Forfar and Perth. He was returned to Parliament (as a Gladstonian Liberal), as member for East Perthshire, in 1885 and again in 1886. He was a generous landlord, and was extremely popular among all classes in the neighbourhood of Hallyburton. On the same date, in London, aged 67, **James Howard**, of Bedford, eldest son of John Howard, of Cauldwell, Bedfordshire. A successful agriculturist and stockbreeder, he was also the senior member of the firm of the Britannia Agricultural Implement Works. Represented Bedford in Parliament as a Liberal 1868-74, and Bedfordshire 1880-5. Married, 1846, Mahala, daughter of P. Thompson, Esq., of Great Bentley, Essex. On the 26th, at Malta, aged 55, **Dame Rachel Emily**, wife of the Hon. Sir Arthur Hamilton Gordon, G.C.M.G., and daughter of Sir John Shaw-Lefevre, K.C.B. On the 27th, at Chislehurst, aged 52, **Paul Frederick Tidman, C.M.G.**, the Secretary of the International Monetary Association, and the founder and developer of the aluminium industry. On the 29th, aged 59, **Charles Spencer Perceval**, secretary to the Commissioners of Lunacy, grandson of the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, who was assassinated in 1812. On the 31st, at Oxford, aged 53, **Gudbrand Vigfusson**, a native of Iceland, who came to England in 1864 to undertake the "Icelandic-English Dictionary." He settled at Oxford, where he was lector in Scandinavian studies.

FEBRUARY.

The Rev. Sir Frederick Boyd, sixth Baronet, of Danson Hill, in the county of Kent, died at his residence, Ballycastle Manor, Antrim, on Feb. 13. He was born Aug. 13, 1820, the second son of Sir John Boyd, third Baronet (whose grandfather was created a Baronet in 1775), by Harriet, his wife, daughter and heiress of Mr. Hugh Boyd, of Bally-

castle, and succeeded to the title at the death, in 1876, of his nephew, Sir Harley Hugh Boyd, Bart. Sir Frederick Boyd was educated at Charterhouse and at University College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1843, and entered Holy Orders. He was Rector of Woudham, Kent, 1854 to 1865; and of Holwell, Beds, 1865 to 1875; and was a

Justice of the Peace for the county of Antrim. He married, first, Aug. 1, 1864, Katharine Mary, only child of Mr. Henry William Beaucherk, of Leekhamptstead, Bucks; and secondly, Jan. 24, 1872, Alice Emily Barbara, only daughter of the late Rev. Heneage Drummond; but leaving no male issue, the baronetcy became extinct on his death.

Major-General Pierrepont Henry Mundy, late Royal Horse Artillery, of Castle Townshend, in the county of Cork, and of Dingle, in the county of Kerry, and brother of the Admiral, Sir George Rodney Mundy, G.C.B., died, on Feb. 16, at Thornbury House, near Gloucester, aged 78. He was the third son of General Godfrey Basil Mundy, of Braconote, Notts, by the Hon. Sarah Brydges, his wife, youngest daughter of the famous Admiral Lord Rodney, and was grandson of Mr Edward Miller Mundy, of Shipley Hall, in the county of Derby. He was educated at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, and entered the Army in 1833, he became Captain in 1845, Major and Lieutenant-Colonel in 1855, Colonel in 1858, and Major-General in 1867; he retired in the latter year. He was a magistrate for the county of Cork. He married first, in 1859, Harriet Georgina, eldest daughter of the late Vice-Admiral Sir George Tyler, K.H., of Cottrell, Glamorganshire, and widow of Mr. E. P. Richards, of Plas Newydd; and secondly, in 1870, Geraldine Henrietta, daughter and coheir of the late Rev. Maurice FitzGerald Townshend, of Castle Townshend.

The Right Hon. Edward Plunkett, sixteenth Lord Dunsany, of Dunsany Castle, in the county of Meath, in the peerage of Ireland, died on Feb. 22, at Hastings. He was the younger son of Edward Wadding, fourteenth Lord Dunsany, by his marriage with the Hon. Charlotte Louisa Lawless, youngest daughter of Nicholas, first Lord Cloncurry, and was born Nov. 29, 1808. He succeeded to the title, as sixteenth Lord, on the death of his brother in 1852. Lord Dunsany entered the Royal Navy in 1823, and attained the rank of Admiral in 1877. He served on the coast of Spain during the Civil War, from 1835 to 1840, and was decorated with the first class of the Order of San Fernando. He was a representative peer for Ireland; he married, Sept. 22, 1846, the Hon. Anne Constance Dutton, third daughter of John, second Lord Sherborne.

Captain William Joseph Eastwick was the eldest son of the late Captain Robert William Eastwick, of Thurlow Square, London, and was born in the year 1808. After receiving his education at Winchester, where Lord Selborne and Lord Sherbrooke were among his contemporaries, he went out to India in 1826 as an ensign in the Bombay Army. He served with General Walsh's force at Kolapore and in the South Mahratta country, and on passing his examination in Persian with great credit he was appointed to the Political Department. His first work was as an assistant to Sir Henry Pottinger in Scinde, and with that province he was closely connected during the last years of his Indian service. In 1839 he was intrusted with the negotiations with the Ameers of Hyderabad, and his efforts were crowned with success by the signature of a treaty throwing open the river Indus to commercial enterprise and freeing it from the obstructions which had closed it to British-Indian traders. During the first Afghan War he was intrusted with the charge of the districts east of the Bolan Pass, and he also officiated as Acting Resident at Hyderabad. He showed great energy and powers of organisation during the winter of 1841-2 in collecting supplies and transport for the army sent forward to reinforce General Nott at Candahar during the troubles in Afghanistan, and he received the thanks of the Government of India for the ability with which he discharged his onerous duties. He came to England in 1841, and did not return to India. In 1846, after having taken a prominent part in the discussions arising out of the annexation of Scinde—a step which he disapproved—he was elected to a seat on the board of directors, and in due course became its deputy-chairman. When India passed out of the hands of the Company into those of the Crown he was one of the directors selected for a seat on the India Council, and he continued to fill that post until his retirement in 1868. Throughout his life Captain Eastwick was distinguished as an earnest friend of the natives of India, and as an energetic supporter of what he deemed to be the right and just policy to be pursued by the English Government. He was a friend of the late Lord Lawrence, whose opinions on Indian matters and policy he generally shared. He was an original member of the Cobden Club, and one of the oldest members of the Athenæum. Captain Eastwick married in 1846 the daughter of Colonel Davidson and the widow of

Mr. Henry Cotes, barrister, of Madras, who died in 1878. Captain Eastwick died in Leinster Gardens, London, Feb. 24, aged 80.

Sir Charles Du Cane, K.C.M.G., Chairman of the Board of Customs, and formerly Governor of Tasmania, died on Feb. 25, at his residence, Braxted Park, near Witham, Essex. He was the son of Captain Charles Du Cane, R.N., of Braxted Park, Essex, and born in 1825. Educated at Charterhouse and Exeter College, Oxon. He was member of Parliament for Maldon in the Conservative interest in 1852-3, and for North Essex in 1857-63, and Civil Lord of the Admiralty 1866-8. From 1868 to 1874 he was Governor of Tasmania, and since 1878 has been Chairman of the Board of Customs. Sir Charles married, in

1863, the Hon. Georgiana, daughter of Lord Lyndhurst.

The Hon. Guy Cuthbert Dawnay, who was killed by a wounded buffalo on Feb. 28, in the bush, in Masailand, where he was passing the winter in hunting and shooting, was the third son of the seventh Viscount Downe. He was born in 1848, and was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. He joined the Army (Rifle Brigade), and served in the Zulu War, 1874, and afterwards in the Suakin Expedition, attached to the Transport Corps. He sat as a Conservative for the North Riding of Yorkshire 1882-5, and unsuccessfully contested the Cleveland Division of the county in 1885, in which year he was appointed Surveyor General of Ordnance, which office he held until its abolition in 1887.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 1st, at his residence, Launceston, Tasmania, aged 75, **Sir Frederick Hughes, Bart.**, of East Bergholt, in the county of Suffolk. He was the second son of the late Rev. Robert Hughes (brother of Sir Richard Hughes, fourth baronet), by Judith, his wife, daughter of Mr. Robert Porteous. He succeeded his cousin, Sir Edward Hughes, sixth Baronet, Aug. 8, 1871. He married, in 1848, Matilda, daughter of Mr. Edmund Yates, but left no issue. On the 2nd, at Fulshaw, Wilmstow, aged 81, **Miss Susan Cobbett**, youngest daughter of William Cobbett, the political writer. On the 4th, at Aberdeen, aged 70, the **Right Rev. John McDonald**, Roman Catholic Bishop of Aberdeen; educated at Rome and consecrated in 1867. On the same date, in Eaton Terrace, aged 70, the **Hon. Spencer Lyttelton**, the son of third Lord Lyttelton. He served some years in the Royal Navy, was appointed Ensign and Lieutenant in the Scots Fusilier Guards, 1839, and retired in 1841; was for a short time during 1847 attached to the Legation at St. Petersburg, was Marshal of the Ceremonies in the Queen's Household 1847-77, married, 1848, Henrietta, daughter of Frederick Hamilton Cornewall, of Delbury Hall, Ludlow. Also on the same date, aged 98, at Lowndes Square, London, **Lady Flower (Mary Jane)**, widow of Sir James Flower, Bart., and eldest daughter of Sir Walter Stirling, first baronet. Also on the same date, at Forthampton Court, Tewkesbury, aged 82, **Joseph Yorke**, a descendant of the first Earl of Hardwicke, son of Joseph Yorke, and Catherine, daughter of James Cocks, Esq. Educated at Eton and St. John's College, Cambridge; married, 1834, Frances Antonia, daughter of Right Hon. Pole-Carew. On the 5th, in Eaton Place, aged 82, **Henry Howard Earl of Effingham**, eldest son of Kenneth Alexander, eleventh Baron Effingham, G.C.B., created Earl of Effingham in 1837. He was educated at Harrow and Oriel College, Oxford; sat as a Liberal for Shaftesbury 1841-5, when he succeeded to the peerage, married, 1832, Eliza, only daughter of General Sir Gordon Drummond, G.C.B. On the 6th, at Kilwick Percy, Yorkshire, aged 82, **Admiral the Hon. Arthur Duncombe**, son of the first Lord Feversham. He entered the Royal Navy in 1819, and in 1834 attained the rank of Post Captain, and became an Admiral on the Retired List in 1862. He sat as a Conservative for East Retford 1830-2, and again from 1835 to 1851; and for the East Riding of Yorkshire from 1851 to 1868. He was Groom-in-Waiting on the Queen 1841-6, and a Lord of the Admiralty in 1852, married, 1836, first Delia, daughter of J. Wilmer Field, of Heaton Hall, York, and second, 1877, Jane Maria, daughter of Sir James Walker, first baronet, of Sand Hutton, York. On the same date, at Tunbridge Wells, aged 84, **Ker Baillie-Hamilton, C.B.**, son of the Ven. Charles Baillie-Hamilton, Archdeacon of Cleveland, and Lady Charlotte, daughter of the ninth Earl of Home. He was educated for the Army at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, entered the Indian Military service in 1822, and in 1826 was transferred as a writer in the Civil Service, and appointed assistant private secretary to the Governor, Sir Lowry Cole; clerk of the Council at the Cape of Good Hope in 1829, and afterwards Colonial Secretary; successively Governor of Barbadoes (1851), Newfoundland (1852), and Antigua and Leeward Islands (1855-63). He

married, in 1834, Emma, daughter of Mr. Charles Blain. On the 8th, aged 84, Anna Maria Goldsmid, daughter of Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, author of many original pamphlets on education. On the 12th, at Tokio, aged 45, Viscount Mori Arifori, Minister of Education in Japan, who had twice held the post of Japanese Minister in England. On the 18th, at Tainfield House, Taunton, aged 78, William Edward Surtees, D.C.L., of Tainfield House, Somerset, and of Seaton Carew, co. Durham. He was born in 1811, the only child of Mr. Edward Surtees, of Seatonburn, in the county of Northumberland; by Anne Catherine, his wife, daughter of Mr. John Ferrand and sister of Mr. Walker Ferrand, of Harden Grange, Yorkshire, M.P. He was educated at Winchester and at University College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1833, and proceeded M.A. in 1836. He became D.C.L. in 1841, and was called to the Bar, at Lincoln's Inn, in 1836. He was J.P. for Northumberland and Somerset, and J.P. and D.-Lt. for Durham, of which county he was High Sheriff in 1866. He married, in 1853, Caroline, widow of Lieutenant-General Sir Stephen Remnant Chapman, C.B., K.C.H., and daughter of the Rev. George Pyke, of Baythorn Park, Essex, Vicar of Wickham Brook. On the 21st, in Guernsey, aged 58, Lieutenant-General John Henry Ford Elkington, C.B., Lt.-Governor of Guernsey and its dependencies. The son of the late James Goodall Elkington, he had served during the Indian Mutiny and in China, and as Quarter-master-General of the Ottoman Contingent in the Crimean War. He married, 1865, Miss Margaret Jameson. On the same date, at Ashill, Norfolk, within ten days of completing his 100th year, the Rev. Bartholomew Edwards, rector of the parish since 1818. On the 22nd, at Dolserau, co. Merioneth, aged 63, Charles Edwards, J.P., D.L., third but only surviving son of Edward Edwards, of Dolserau; married, 1848, Mary Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Mr. W. Tate, of Kilbuck, co. Peebles; sat for Windsor 1866-8; High Sheriff for Merionethshire 1871. On the 24th, aged 67, Philip Henry de la Motte, F.S.A., a writer upon art, and an illustrator of books. He was one of the earliest pioneers of art photography. On the 25th, at Rome, aged 80, Cardinal Sacconi, for some years Papal Nuncio at Paris. On the 27th, aged 84, at Kilcoleman, Bandon, co. Cork, General John Longfield, C.B. He was born in 1804, the second son of Colonel John Longfield, of Longueville, co. Cork, by Eleanor, daughter of Mr. John Lucas, of Mount Lucas, King's Co. He entered the Army in 1825, became Colonel in 1854, General in 1876, and Colonel Liverpool Regiment in 1881. He commanded the 2nd Brigade at the Siege of Delhi in 1857, the Reserve during the assault and in the city during the six days' fighting that ensued. For these services he received a medal with clasp and the Companionship of the Bath. He married, April 29, 1861, Frances Patience, daughter of the Rev. Mountfort Longfield, M.A., Rector of Desertseiges, near Cork.

MARCH.

The Rev. John George Wood, M.A., F.L.S., who died suddenly at Coventry on the 3rd, was the son of a surgeon, at one time chemical lecturer at Middlesex Hospital. He was born in London in 1827, and was educated first at Ashbourne Grammar School, and afterwards at Merton College, Oxford, which he entered in 1844. In the following year he was elected Jackson scholar, and he graduated B.A. in 1848 and M.A. in 1851. After being attached for two years to the Anatomical Museum at Christ Church, Oxford, he was ordained in 1852 as chaplain to the Boatmen's Floating Chapel. This post he held for four years, and in 1856 he was appointed assistant chaplain to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which post he resigned in 1862, and from 1868 to 1876 he held the office of Precentor of the Canterbury Diocesan Choral Union.

Among the large number of publications that appeared from Mr Wood's pen were many valuable works on zoology, specially adapted for the instruction of young readers, such as "A Popular Natural History," "Sketches and Anecdotes of Animal Life," "The Boy's Own Natural History Book," and "My Feathered Friends, or Bird Life." He also produced a series of entertaining handbooks, comprising "Common Objects of the Seashore" (perhaps the best known of all his works), "Common Objects of the Country," and others with similar titles, all of them fully illustrated. Among these smaller works must also be mentioned such widely-read books as "Homes Without Hands," "Insects at Home," and "Our Garden Friends and Foes." The most important book that Mr. Wood wrote was his larger "Natural History," in three volumes, enriched

with a number of admirable sketches, the greater part of them from the life, by artists of the highest rank as animal painters. Mr. Wood edited for some time the *Boy's Own Magazine*, the pages of which periodical constantly contained work from his hands. Among his more recent works are the "Old Testament History" and "New Testament History," written for the use of preparatory schools; the "Natural History of Man," and other educational works; "Man and Beast Here and Hereafter," "Nature's Teaching," "Out of Doors," "The Lane and Field," and a long series of natural-history readings for schools, published in 1882. In 1879 he projected a series of "Sketch Lectures" on zoology, illustrating them himself by drawings in coloured pastels on a large canvas. These lectures were delivered in all the principal institutes of England and Scotland, and did almost as much as his books to popularise the study of natural history.

Edmond Henri Adolphe Scherer, who died at Versailles on the 16th, was born in Paris, April 8, 1815, and was educated at the Collège Bourbon. After spending two years in England, he went to Strasburg and devoted himself to the study of theology, and in 1843 accepted the appointment of Professor of Exegesis at the Ecole Evangélique at Geneva. At Geneva he was an intimate friend of many young men who afterwards became famous in literature, especially Alexandre Vinet, Victor Clierbulhez, and Henri Frédéric Amiel. In addition to his professional duties, M. Scherer at this time undertook the editorship of *La Réformation au XIX^e Siècle*. In 1850, finding that his theological views had become considerably modified, he gave up his post, and from that time became one of the foremost men in the liberal movement of Protestant theology. Meantime he left Geneva, married an English lady, and settled at Versailles, where he lived until his death. It was at the time of the Franco-German War that he first took an active part in politics; during the occupation of Versailles by the German troops M. Scherer was indefatigable in his services to the town, and was elected a member of the Municipal Council. On July 2, 1871, he was elected to the National Assembly for the Department of Seine-et-Oise, and in 1875 was chosen a life Senator. He was to the very end constant in his attendance in the Senate, though he seldom or never spoke. He belonged to the group of Moderate Republicans.

He thought with Thiers that the Republic was the only possible form of government in France, as being the form which caused least division among parties; but his general attitude of mind was more or less sceptical, and he anticipated no unmixed blessings from the spread of democracy. His two or three political pamphlets, one on Revision (published just at the time of Gambetta's accession to office) and one on Democracy, were, in point of fact, veiled laments on the state and prospects of France, bearing a distinct likeness to the "Popular Government" which the author's friend, Sir Henry Maine, published some time afterwards. Besides these pamphlets, M. Scherer wrote during many years some of the principal political articles in *Le Temps*, and at one time he may be said to have had the foreign policy of that paper entirely in his hands. His principal work, however, was not political but purely literary, and from the time when he ceased to occupy himself mainly with theological questions his writings were almost entirely concerned with literature, literary history, and philosophy. His seven volumes of "Etudes" have been largely read both in France and England, and though there are many points of distinction between him and Sainte-Beuve, yet of all contemporary critics, M. Scherer came nearest to the master. His criticism was singularly frank, clear, and individual. He had read immensely both in his own ample library and elsewhere, his judgment had been well formed, and he always said what he meant to say without fear or favour. His English studies proved to be of great value to him, and the late Matthew Arnold awarded the high praise to his essay on Milton; and the same critic had just as high an opinion of M. Scherer's judgments on Shakespeare, Byron, and Goethe. M. Scherer frequently visited England, where his wide knowledge, his upright character, and his genial manner won him the esteem and affection of a large circle of friends. He retained to the last the keenest interest in English politics and literature, and was one of the few friends of England on the Paris Press.

The Rev. Josiah Leslie Porter, D.D., was the youngest son of Lieutenant William Porter, of Burt, in the county of Donegal, and was born in 1823, and received his first instruction from the Rev. Mr. Craig, a leading Presbyterian minister in the locality. He afterwards entered the Universities of Glasgow and

Edinburgh and the Free Church College, and had a successful career. Having been ordained for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, he had a call from a congregation in the north of England. He resigned this after some time, and went out as a missionary to Damascus, accredited by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Before he left for Damascus in 1849 he married a daughter of the late Rev. Dr. Cook, a distinguished member of the Presbyterian Church, who took a prominent part in public life. After spending five years in Damascus his health gave way, and he returned to Ireland, the incidents of his missionary life in Syria being subsequently embodied in a book. In 1859 he was elected to the Professorship of Biblical Criticism in the Assembly College, Belfast, and was highly esteemed as a most painstaking and efficient lecturer. In 1867, the secretary of the college having died, Dr. Porter was appointed to succeed him, and retained the office until 1878, when he resigned on his appointment as one of the Assistant Commissioners of Intermediate Education. This position he held for only twelve months, as an opportunity occurred of conferring upon him a more important appointment on the resignation of the presidency of the Queen's College, Belfast, by the late Rev. Dr. Henry in 1879. He was also a member of the Senate of the Royal University. He was a zealous advocate of the principle of non-sectarian education and devotedly attached to the Queen's College system, and especially to the Belfast College. Dr. Porter was the author of "The Great Cities of Bashan" and other works, including a series of geographical articles in "Kitto's Biblical Encyclopædia." He frequently contributed to current literature, and was always ready to do battle with his pen whenever an attack was made on the educational institutions in which he was interested. After a comparatively short illness, his death occurred quite unexpectedly on the 16th, at Belfast, aged 65.

Samuel Carter Hall was born at Topsham, Devon, in 1801, the fourth son of Colonel Robert Hall. He was very early called to the Bar and, like so many others who have afterwards distinguished themselves in literature, he began to earn money as a reporter in the gallery of the House of Commons. In 1824 he married Anna Maria Fielding, a lady of Irish birth, who came from French blood on the mother's side. She died in 1881,

at the age of 79, having been born the year after her husband. Very soon after his marriage, Mr. Hall founded and edited the *Amulet*, one of the annuals so rife at the time, and now so completely forgotten. It was in this that Mr. and Mrs. Hall first co-operated in writing a story illustrative of Irish life. About 1838 the poet Campbell, who had just lost his wife, and who only lived a short and unhappy life after her death, resigned the editorship of the *New Monthly Magazine*, of which he had been editor for many years. Mr. Hall was appointed to succeed him, and the new editor from this moment up to the time when he gave up writing altogether devoted himself to the popularisation of art. In 1838 he founded the *Art Journal*, which only prolonged its life through the extraordinary perseverance of its founder; the management of which he retained until 1880. Among the numerous works written by him may be mentioned the "Book of Gems," the "Book of British Ballads," and "Baronial Halls." In many other works he was assisted by Mrs. Hall. Between them they produced between 300 and 400 volumes. Mr. Hall's last work appeared in 1883, "The Retrospect of a Long Life." In 1880 he received a pension from the Civil List of 150*l.* a year. Mr. Hall and his wife were advocates of the cause of temperance, and he himself helped to found, and was indefatigable in supporting, a large number of charitable institutions in London. He died in Kensington on the 16th, in his eighty-eighth year, having retained his faculties to the last.

Sir Thomas Gladstone, of Fasque, Kincardineshire, second baronet, was born at Annfield, near Liverpool, on July 25, 1804. The eldest son of Sir John Gladstone, by his second wife, the daughter of Mr. Andrew Robertson, of Dingwall, he was educated at Eton and at Oxford University. A few years later the University conferred on him the degree of D.C.L. In 1835 he married Louisa, second daughter of Mr. Robert Fellowes, of Shotesham Park, Norfolk, who survived him, and by whom he had issue three daughters and a son, John Robert Gladstone, Captain in the Coldstream Guards since 1885, who succeeded to the title and estates. Fasque and Balbegno were left in strict entail by Sir John Gladstone, but Phesdo was left in fee-simple. The deceased succeeded to the estates in December 1857, in which year his father died at the age of 87. When a young man Sir Thomas was for some

time an unpaid Attaché to the British Embassy in Paris. Like his brother, the ex-Premier, he was brought up as a Tory of the strictest sort, and such he remained through life. In his twenty-sixth year he was returned with Mr. John Capel to Parliament for Queenborough, Kent, a constituency disfranchised by the Reform Bill of 1832, possessed by the Boards of Ordnance and Admiralty. A double return was made for the borough, but a petition was presented against Mr. Holmes and Sir P. Durham, which they declined to oppose. In 1832 Queenborough having been disfranchised by the Reform Bill, Mr. Gladstone was returned for Portarlington by a majority of one vote over his opponent, also a Conservative. He represented that borough for three years, and in 1835 he was elected one of the members for Leicester, a seat that he held for only two years. In 1842 he was returned for Ipswich, but was unseated on petition for bribery and treating on the part of his agents. Sir Thomas attempted to re-enter Parliament in 1865, when he contested Kincardineshire against the late Mr. Dyce Nicol, of Ballogie. The contest was long and severe, and resulted in the defeat of Sir Thomas by 202 votes. He did not again come forward as a candidate for Parliamentary honours. When Mr. W. E. Gladstone stood for Oxford University Sir Thomas voted against him, showing that his convictions were stronger than the ties of kinship. At the same time, the difference of their political views did not lead to any estrangement between the brothers. In 1856 Sir Thomas Gladstone added to the family possessions by purchasing from Lord Southesk, the estate of Strachan and Glendye, for which he paid about 70,000*l*. In all agricultural matters the deceased took a deep and intelligent interest. He founded a herd of pure-bred polled cattle, and by careful breeding and selection he raised the Fasque herd to a high reputation. On the death of the late Sir James Burnett, of Leys, Lord Beaconsfield appointed Sir Thomas Gladstone Lord Lieutenant of Kincardineshire. He was a warm and genuine friend, and his political opponents were ever ready to admire his honest and consistent adherence to his creed. Sir John Gladstone, the first baronet, was for nearly sixty years a well known merchant in Liverpool. He was grandson of John Gladstones, of Lanarkshire, who was descended from the Gledstaines, and in 1835 he obtained a Royal licence to alter the spelling of

the name to the form which is now known to everybody. He had been in feeble health for some little time, but was able to transact business and to drive out daily; but a chill, which brought on an attack of bronchitis, proved fatal, and he died on the 16th, at Fasque House, Kincardineshire. His brother, Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, travelled from London to attend the funeral, at which a large concourse of friends and tenants testified to the esteem in which he was held by his neighbours.

The Duke of Buckingham.—The Right Hon. Richard Plantagenet Campbell Temple Nugent Bydges Chandos Grenville, third Duke and fourth Marquess of Buckingham and Chandos, Earl Temple of Stowe (1822), Earl Temple (1749), Viscount and Baron Cobham, Lord Kinloss (in the peerage of Scotland), and Earl Nugent (in the peerage of Ireland), was the only son of the second Duke. The latter occupied a conspicuous position in the Tory party, being the leader of the landed interest. He married in 1819 Mary, daughter of the first Marquess of Breadalbane, and they had issue a son and a daughter. The son, born on September 10, 1823, was educated at Eton and Oxford, and subsequently received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from his university. He sat in the House of Commons as member for Buckingham from 1846 to 1857. He was a Junior Lord of the Treasury in Lord Derby's brief administration of 1852, and Keeper of the Prince of Wales's Privy Seal and Deputy Warden of the Stannaries. The Marquess of Chandos was elected chairman of the London and North-Western Railway Company in 1853, and in this position displayed first-class business qualities. He resigned the chairmanship in 1861, and on July 29 in the same year succeeded to the dukedom on the death of his father. When Lord Derby came into office in July 1866 he appointed the Duke of Buckingham Lord President of the Council. He held this appointment until March 1867, when he succeeded the Earl of Carnarvon as Secretary for the Colonies. Ably and with acceptance he fulfilled the duties of this onerous post until the Derby Ministry went out of office in December 1868. In July 1875 he was appointed Governor of Madras, and he held that appointment until 1880. During his term of office he energetically grappled with the terrible famine of 1876 and 1877. He instituted relief on a large

scale early in the visitation, and by the end of July 1877 there were in receipt of gratuitous relief 889,000 persons in the Madras districts, besides 160,000 in the Bombay districts and 151,000 in the Mysore districts. Relief works were also instituted, and by the end of April of the above year 716,000 labourers were employed in connection with these works in the Madras districts alone. As the instance of the Duke of Buckingham the Lord Mayor of London organised a relief fund on behalf of the sufferers, and by December 1877 the sum of 475,000*l.* had been sent out to India for distribution.

On the death of Lord Redesdale in 1886 the Duke was chosen Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords, on the nomination of Lord Salisbury. In this capacity he was well and favourably known to all those who were thrown into business relations with him in the House of Lords. The Duke of Buckingham was a staunch Conservative, but he seldom spoke at length upon political questions. He was elected Chairman of the Bucks Quarter Sessions in 1867, and was re-elected to that post on his return from India in 1881.

The Duke was twice married, but left no son, and the dukedom and marquissate of Buckingham and Chandos became extinct. By his first wife, Caroline, daughter of Mr. Robert Harvey, of Langley Park, Bucks, he left issue three daughters, of whom the eldest, Lady Mary Morgan, wife of Captain L. F. H. C. Morgan, inherited the Scotch Barony of Kinloss. The Duke married secondly, in 1886, Alice Anne, daughter of Sir Graham Montgomery, by whom he left no children. The earldom of Temple consequently passed to the Duke's nephew, Mr. William Stephen Gore-Langton, who sat for Mid-Somerset from 1878 to 1885, son of the late Lady Anna Eliza Mary, daughter of the second Duke, and the late Mr. William Henry Powell Gore-Langton, M.P. Up to within a week of his death, which occurred at Chandos House, Cavendish Square, on the 26th, he had sat as Chairman of Committees, but his illness (diabetes) suddenly took an unfavourable turn, and medical skill was unavailing.

Right Hon. John Bright, M.P.—John Bright was descended from a family of farmers, who in the reign of James II. lived near Lyneham, in Wiltshire. In the early part of the eighteenth century a member of the family, Abraham Bright, migrated to Coventry and en-

gaged in trade, whilst still preserving his connection with the Quaker body. Abraham Bright's grandson Jacob was born in Coventry, and married Martha Lucas, by whom he had eight children, of whom the youngest was also christened Jacob. He was educated at the Friends' School at Ackworth, near Pontefract, and was subsequently apprenticed to William Holme, a farmer and small manufacturer, at New Mills, in Derbyshire. In the beginning of this century two of Mr. Holmes's sons removed to Rochdale, where they built a mill called Hanging Bowl Mill, and in it Jacob Bright found employment. In 1809, with the assistance of friends who had recognised his energy and business talents, Jacob Bright set up on his own account a mill at Rochdale, of which in 1823 he became the sole proprietor. He was three times married, and by his second wife—a Miss Wood, of Bolton—he had a numerous family, of which several members became known to the public. His eldest child died at four years of age, so that almost from the first John Bright, the second born, was the eldest member of the family. He was born at Green Bank, Rochdale, on November 16, 1811. His first schoolmaster was a Mr. Littlewood, of Townhead, Rochdale; at eleven years of age he went for a year to Ackworth; then for two years to a Mr. Simpson's school at York; and, finally, for eighteen months to another school at Newton, near Clitheroe, close to the river Hodder, where he first formed that taste for fishing which never left him, and in the gratification of which he found to the end of his days his chief out-door amusement. From his earliest years he was a careful student of English poetry, and English political history always interested him keenly, no small part of his stock of enthusiasm in favour of the Liberal cause arising from his study of the history of the early Quakers, especially that of his great-great-grandfather, John Gratton, one of the victims of the penal laws of Charles II. The first record that we have of Mr. Bright's interest in actual politics dates from the Preston election of 1830, when the late Lord Derby (then Mr. Stanley) was beaten by the celebrated "Orator Hunt," to the great delight of the Radicals of Lancashire. But it was not on a political question that the young politician made his first speech. About this time, or a little later, Mr. Silk Buckingham, well known in his day from his connection with the *Athenæum* newspaper and with many other literary ventures, went down to Rochdale to

deliver a lecture on the then unacknowledged theme of Eastern travel; and young John Bright, at that time not more than twenty years of age, moved a vote of thanks to the lecturer. A short time afterwards we have more interesting evidence of the care with which he was beginning to devote himself to the art of public speaking. Mr. Aldis, a Baptist minister of distinction, came to Rochdale to speak at a meeting of the Bible Society, and on that occasion Mr. Bright made his first public speech, which Mr. Aldis described some years "later as very eloquent and powerful, and carried away the meeting, but it was elaborate and *memoriter*. On our way back, as I congratulated him, he said that such efforts cost him too dear, and asked me how I spoke so easily. I then took the full advantage of my seniority to set forth my notions, which I need not repeat here, except this—that in his case, as in most, I thought it would be best not to burden the memory too much, but having carefully prepared and committed any portions where special effect was desired, merely to put down other things in the desired order, leaving the wording of them to the moment." The lesson thus given to John Bright was well remembered by him in after life, as well as his debt to the teacher.

Though Rochdale, like the rest of Lancashire, was deeply stirred by the Reform agitation of 1831-2, John Bright did not personally take any part in this agitation. During these and the following years, however, he continued to practise himself in public speaking, especially in the debates of the Rochdale Literary and Philosophical Society, in connection with which the notes of several of his speeches have been preserved. It is still more interesting to find that he delivered an elaborate speech about the year 1836 on Disestablishment—a speech of which it may fairly be said that it anticipated nearly all the arguments with which the Liberation Society has since then made us familiar. It was a short time before this utterance that Mr. Bright had first declared himself on the subject which was for the next ten years to occupy his mind, to the exclusion of almost every other question, and in connection with which he was destined to become one of the most conspicuous men of the day. In 1836 Mr. John Feilden, the member for Oldham, published a pamphlet called "The Curse of the Factory System," in which he took up ground which was very commonly occupied during the coming debates on factory

questions—namely, that the great danger to English trade lay in the hard treatment of the factory operatives by their masters. Sir Robert Peel had spoken more or less in this sense in the year 1816; in 1833 a Commission had investigated the matter, and much of the evidence taken before it was quoted by Mr. Feilden in confirmation of his views. It was natural that this way of putting the matter should excite the wrath of a Liberal manufacturer of Mr. Bright's stamp; and in a pamphlet written in answer to Mr. Feilden he anticipated most of the arguments which he was to use eight years later in the important speech which he delivered against Lord Ashley's amendment to the Government Bill for the regulation of labour in factories. Mr. Bright, while endeavouring to show the impossibility of proposals like Mr. Feilden's, pointed to quite a different source as the danger to English trade. The Lancashire operatives, he fully admitted, were overworked and underfed, but the real remedy for these evils was to be looked for in the abolition of the Corn Laws, which would, by cheapening food and raising wages, make such slavery unnecessary to them.

The struggle for Free Trade was against a monopoly cherished as the apple of their eye by the privileged class; and even in 1840, after eight years of a reformed Parliament, the power of the privileged class was almost irresistible. The leaders of the assault were men who had to make their position for themselves: they belonged to neither Whig nor Tory families; they were at first not even members of Parliament; they had no great newspaper strongly on their side. They were forced to trust to facts, to reason, and to eloquence alone. They rested neither on social and political prestige on the one side nor on intimidation on the other. Their aim from the beginning of the contest till the moment of final triumph was to act upon the Government and upon Parliament through the constituencies; to convert the minority, first among the voters and then among their representatives, into a majority, and to sweep away the obnoxious impost by a vote that expressed the fairly-formed opinion of the country. It was, indeed, natural that they should incur unpopularity, and that those who felt themselves attacked and defeated by them should, for many years after the triumph of the League, speak of Cobden and Bright with hostility and bitterness. Mr. Bright, indeed, gave grounds enough

for such language. Essentially combative by nature, he seemed to enjoy assailing an abuse; and, with the instinct of the popular orator, he was always glad to identify the abuses with some class of living men whom he could hold up to the reprobation of his audience. Landlords, bishops, soldiers, and the Tory party in general—Mr. Bright seldom spoke to a popular audience without denouncing one or other of them.

The active movement in favour of Free Trade may be said to have really begun in the autumn and winter of 1836-7. The harvest had been very bad; a commercial crisis brought about numerous heavy failures, the distress among the working population was severe. At this time the first of the Anti-Corn Law Associations was formed in London, numbering twenty-two members of Parliament and many other well-known persons. Grote, Sir William Molesworth, Roebuck, Silk Buckingham, Joseph Hume, and Colonel Thompson among the members of the House of Commons, the poets Campbell and Ebenezer Elliott, men of letters like Laman Blanchard, William Howitt, and Archibald Prentice (the future historian of the League) were enrolled in its list. It was not till the next year, however, that the work began in serious earnest, and then it was from Manchester, not from London, that the impulse came. At a meeting hastily summoned to welcome Dr. Bowring, in September 1838, a proposal was made to form an Anti-Corn Law Association in Manchester; seven men—all, it would seem, Scotchmen by birth—met next day to arrange details, and in a short time a first list of the Provisional Committee was issued. It contained the name of John Bright, of Rochdale; and a second and fuller list, published immediately afterwards, contained that of Richard Cobden, of Moseley. Other local associations were formed very soon afterwards. In January the first subscription list was opened, and in a month the sums given amounted to 6,38*l*. On March 20, 1839, after one or two Parliamentary defeats, a meeting of the provincial delegates took place in London, and it was there agreed to recommend "the formation of a permanent union, to be called the Anti-Corn Law League, composed of all the towns and districts represented in the delegation, and as many others as might be induced to form Anti-Corn Law Associations and to join the League." The work before the League had been laid

down just before by Cobden. The House of Commons had declined to hear representatives of the Manchester Association at the bar. "The delegates," said Cobden, "had offered to instruct the House, the House had refused to be instructed. But the House must be instructed, and the most unexceptionable and effectual way will be by instructing the nation."

The first public meeting addressed by Mr. Bright on this subject seems to have been one held in the open air at Rochdale early in 1839. At that time the Free Traders had to contend not only against the agricultural interest on the one hand, but against the Chartists on the other; these latter, who were finding at that moment great support among the working men of Lancashire, holding that political reform must come before fiscal reform, and that no House of Commons elected on the suffrage of 1832 would ever repeal the Corn Laws. It was urged with convincing force on the other side that no such House of Commons would ever grant the Charter and establish manhood suffrage; but the answer was not deemed conclusive, and the Chartists were for some years one of the great difficulties with which the Free Traders had to contend. In this particular meeting a Chartist amendment was carried against Mr. Bright, and the Rochdale operatives for some time longer chose to dream of the blessings of the ballot, manhood suffrage, and equal electoral districts, rather than to put their hands to the removal of a practical grievance which pressed heavily upon them all. For a year or two longer Mr. Bright's interference was only occasional; the League was doing well, and he had other matters to think of. In 1839 he married Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. Jonathan Priestman, of Newcastle; but in less than two years she died. The touching story of her death and of the influence which it indirectly had upon his career was told by himself, in the beautiful speech which he delivered at the unveiling of the Cobden statue at Bradford in July 1877:—

"It was in September, in the year 1841. . . . At that time I was at Leamington, and I was, on the day when Mr. Cobden called on me—for he happened to be there at the time on a visit to some relatives—I was in the depths of grief, I may almost say of despair; for the light and sunshine of my house had been extinguished. All that was left on earth of my young wife, except the memory of a sainted

life and of a too brief happiness, was lying still and cold in the chamber above us. Mr. Cobden called upon me as his friend, and addressed me, as you might suppose, with words of condolence. After a time he looked up and said, 'There are thousands of houses in England at this moment where wives, mothers, and children are dying of hunger. Now,' he said, 'when the first paroxysm of your grief is over, I would advise you to come to me, and we will never rest till the Corn Law is repealed.'"

The invitation was accepted, and from that time till the day when total repeal was granted Mr. Bright flung himself heart and soul into the agitation. His speech at a great meeting at the Crown and Anchor Hotel, in the Strand, in February 1842, has been generally marked as that which first brought him very prominently before the public, at least in London and the south of England. He aided in the formation of provincial branches of the League, and during the summer and autumn of that year he is said to have made important speeches in fourteen large towns at least, his greatest and most successful effort being the speech which he delivered at the Manchester Corn Exchange on December 29. By this time people were naturally beginning to talk of sending so powerful a speaker to Parliament; and accordingly in the following March (1843) he came forward as a candidate for the city of Durham, in the room of Captain Fitzroy, appointed Governor of New Zealand. Mr. Bright only appeared as a candidate on the very day of the nomination, well knowing that he was fighting on a forlorn hope. Lord Dungannon, his opponent, had the advantage of family influence, which had been exercised through a careful canvass, while Mr. Bright had nothing to trust to but his cause and his power of pleading it. His speech was, as might have been expected, a vigorous onslaught upon the system of which the Corn Law was the expression—an attack, carried out with all the force of which he was master, upon the law that impoverished the many in order to keep up the rents of the few. "Men," he said, "are almost fighting with each other for employment and wages and food. And no power under heaven can diminish that competition, or give increased comfort, or cause a steady demand for labour, unless it be the repeal of that law which diminishes the demand for labour, reduces wages, makes you compete with

each other constantly and of necessity, and turns the whole force and beggary of this competition into the means of increasing the rental of the noble lords and landlords who made that law." The show of hands—it was in the days of an open hustings—was all in Mr. Bright's favour; but at the poll Lord Dungannon received 507 votes and Mr. Bright 405—a much closer fight than anyone could have foretold under the circumstances. Lord Dungannon, however, was unseated on petition, and Mr. Bright again came forward, and, having by this time become better known to the Durham people, was elected by 488 votes to 410.

Mr. Bright took his seat on July 28, 1843, amid the acclamations of the Free Traders throughout the kingdom. He did not remain silent long, but delivered his maiden speech on August 7 on Mr. Ewart's motion in favour of carrying out the recommendations of the Import Duties Commission of 1840. The House was thin—much thinner than would be the case at the present day on the occasion of the first appearance of a newly-elected member of great outside reputation; but Mr. Bright, though to speak to empty benches was to him a novelty, made a vigorous oration which at once showed that he would be a power in the House as well as in the country. What was especially remarkable in this first utterance of his was its closing exhortation to Sir Robert Peel, whom Mr. Bright was already endeavouring to separate from his party and to convert into what he called a Minister of the People. "I should rejoice," he said, "to see the right hon. baronet disconnect himself from the party whose principles he declares to be unsound. . . . He may have a laudable ambition—he may seek renown—but no man can be truly great who is content to serve an oligarchy who regard no interest but their own, and whose legislation proves that they have no sympathy with the wants of the great body of their countrymen." It was in the winter of this year that the celebrated election for the City of London took place, in which Mr. Thomas Baring and the Conservatives were beaten by Mr. Pattison, the Free Trade candidate. At the same time it was proposed to raise a fund of 100,000*l.* in furtherance of the objects of the League, and at the first meeting in Manchester 12,500*l.* were subscribed in the room. Soon afterwards the Marquess of Westminster sent 500*l.* to the fund, and the League could boast of having secured in his person and in

those of Mr. Jones-Lloyd and Mr. Marshall, of Leeds, the three wealthiest living representatives of the noblemen, financiers, and manufacturers of the country. In the coming session the Corn Law question was twice raised in the House, though the most that the Free Traders could muster was about 130 votes. Mr. Bright spoke upon both occasions, and indeed he was not slow to turn every debate that referred in any way to "the condition of England question" into a means for advocating Repeal. But it had already been borne in upon the mind of the League that it was of little use to petition the existing Parliament. Instead, the registers began to be looked into carefully, and in many parts of England with the most promising results; in Lancashire, for example, the majority for the Free Traders seemed secure. Cobden's famous suggestion that the party should secure its hold upon the counties by a large creation of forty-shilling freeholders was widely adopted; and meanwhile the propaganda of the League doctrines did not slacken. The activity of the leaders grew all the greater as they began to see victory within their grasp.

Then came the potato famine, and its well-known results. The *Times* of December 4, 1845, startled the country by the announcement that Parliament would meet early in January, and that the Queen's Speech would announce the intention of Ministers to propose an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. In vain this statement was described in other journals as "an atrocious fabrication." The event proved that it was true. What followed is known to every one. The Ministerial crisis took place, Sir Robert resigned, and on the failure of Lord John Russell to form a Ministry was at once replaced in power, his Cabinet having only been modified by the substitution of Mr. Gladstone for Lord Stanley (the late Lord Derby) as Secretary for the Colonies. When Parliament met on Jan. 22 Sir Robert Peel announced that his opinions on the Corn Laws were completely changed, and during the next week, in a long and elaborate speech, he set forth the programme of the Government. The Corn Laws were to cease to exist at the end of three years. In the meantime the duty was to be reduced to a maximum of 10s., falling to the minimum of 4s. when the price of wheat reached 53s. per quarter. Grain from British colonies was to be admitted free of duty, and Indian corn at a nominal duty, while many hundreds of miscellaneous articles

were to be struck out of the tariff. It is not necessary to dwell upon the general aspects of this celebrated debate and of those which followed it, made historical as they were not only by the importance of the issues involved, but by the philippics which Mr. Disraeli delivered against his former leader. We need only remark upon the part which Mr. Bright took. He spoke with all his accustomed animation, and warmed by a generosity that was inspired by the consciousness of success. Speaking on the night after the Prime Minister, "I watched the right hon. baronet as he went home last night, and for the first time I envied him his feelings. That speech has circulated by scores of thousands throughout the kingdom and throughout the world; and wherever a man is to be found who loves justice, and wherever there is a labourer whom you have trampled under foot, that speech will bring joy to the heart of the one and hope to the breast of the other." Peel carried the abolition of the Corn Laws, but could not take the House with him in other measures. He fell on the Irish Coercion Bill, and Lord John Russell reigned in his stead, with Lord Palmerston for Foreign Secretary, Sir George Grey at the Home Office, and Macaulay as Paymaster-General with a seat in the Cabinet. The expected dissolution took place in 1847, and Mr. Bright was at once requested by the Liberals of Manchester to become their representative. He could not decline an invitation from the capital of his own county and the centre of the population among whom he had spent his life. He parted regretfully from Durham, and with the late Mr. Milner-Gibson presented himself to the Manchester electors, to be returned without a contest. In the same year he married for the second time, his wife being Miss Margaret Elizabeth Leatham, daughter of the well-known Wakefield banker.

The Free Trade controversy once settled, Mr. Bright had time to turn his mind to other great questions—Ireland, India, Russia, and Parliamentary reform. With these his name is inseparably associated, while few other questions of importance, domestic or international, could be seriously discussed in Parliament during the years of his prime without some elaborate contribution from him. His speeches on the Civil War in America, for example, did much to keep the advanced Liberal party firm in its allegiance to the cause of the North; and, again, whenever in or out of Parliament the question of religious

establishments has been raised, he has always had something effective to say in defence of those principles of pure voluntarism in which he was brought up. Collateral questions, of which the three most important have been Church Rates, University Tests, and Burials, always found in him a powerful partisan, and few finer speeches were ever made by him than that which he made just before the Burials question was finally settled. He also made several speeches in favour of the Abolition of Capital Punishment.

Speaking generally, it may be said that Mr. Bright, in the views which he put from the beginning expressed on Irish matters, anticipated all the legislation of recent years. Author of the phrase, "Force is no remedy," in the main his treatment of Irish questions may be described as a long endeavour to discover such remedies for Irish grievances as should satisfy the wants of reasonable men, and should make the phrase "the United Kingdom" the expression of a fact. From the beginning he always attacked the Irish Church Establishment in the most uncompromising way. In 1850 he wrote a letter to the late Sir John Gray detailing an elaborate scheme for buying out the Established Church from its connection with the State, for bestowing a reasonable endowment upon the Roman Catholics and upon the Presbyterians, and for bidding them go their own way and manage their own affairs.

Nearly a quarter of a century was, however, to pass before the Irish Church question was ripe for legislation, and meanwhile Mr. Bright turned his attention to other subjects of public interest and importance. Amongst these, the policy which led to the Crimean War occupied a prominent place, and the attitude adopted by Mr. Bright and his friends brought upon them for a time much censure and obloquy from the majority of their fellow-countrymen. His first public speech against intervention was at that curious conference of the Peace Society at Edinburgh on October 13, 1853, when Sir Charles Napier had ventured to present himself among the quiet people there assembled and to put in a vehement plea in favour of large armaments and of "soldiers as the best peacemakers." The external agitation against the war was, however, of a very limited kind. Cobden himself regretted afterwards that he had not tried to raise Yorkshire; and in the Lancashire towns, as throughout the country, the advocates of military measures had their own way completely.

In the House of Commons Mr. Bright made at least three of his most moving and eloquent speeches against the war, but without avail. The position of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, who acted in complete harmony on this matter, as on every other, has often been misunderstood; but he was always careful in his speeches at that time, as he was careful in 1877, to base his opposition to a war between England and Russia on the ground of British interests.

In the course of the same year (1853) he had also delivered his first important speech in the debate on Sir Charles Wood's Bill for the Better Government of India—a Bill which may be shortly described as attempting a *via media*, to reform the Company by introducing a number of Crown nominees on the Board of Directors. Mr. Bright was against any such compromise. He attacked the whole system of the Company's government. He thought the Leadenhall Street system far too irresponsible, and far too likely to produce a tyrannical and short-sighted method of government, and, moreover, he objected to its ill-defined and clumsy relations to the Board of Control. The Bill was withdrawn, but not until Mr. Bright had had occasion to show how thoroughly he had grasped the nature of the difficulties by which our administration of Indian affairs was beset.

The agitation and excitement of this stormy period had the result of breaking down Mr. Bright's health. His nervous system was for the time greatly shattered, and early in the year 1856 he was compelled to withdraw from public life. Lord Brougham offered him his villa at Cannes, but Mr. Bright preferred to spend some months in Yorkshire, at the shooting-box of his friend Mr. Edward Ellice, at Glengarry, and at Haddo House. In the autumn he left England for Algiers and Nice, and in January, finding himself but little better, he offered to resign his seat for Manchester. The offer was not accepted, but two months later there came the Parliamentary defeat of Lord Palmerston on the question of the quarrel with China. A dissolution followed. Mr. Bright was unable to fight his own battle, and without his powerful voice to aid his cause that cause was defeated. He and Mr. Milner-Gibson were rejected, to the consternation of the advanced Liberal party throughout the country. But a few months later, though he was compelled to abstain from taking an active part in public affairs of any kind, it was proposed that he should fill a vacancy

in the representation of Birmingham, and he was elected without opposition to the seat, which he continued to hold until Birmingham was divided by the Act of 1885, after which he was chosen for the Central Division.

The first use to which Mr. Bright applied his eloquence on the recovery of his health, was to stem popular excitement on the suppression of the Indian Mutiny, and to draw from this disaster lessons for future guidance. Even Lord Palmerston, who was not often disposed to anticipate popular demands, judged it prudent to bring forward, in the session of 1858, a Bill for putting the possessions of the East India Company under the direct authority of the Crown. But the fall of his Ministry on the Conspiracy Bill prevented any full discussion of the measure. Lord Derby succeeded to office, and in the following session a second India Bill was introduced and withdrawn; and a third India Bill, which ultimately became law, was brought in in the month of June. It was on this occasion that Mr. Bright proposed a great measure of decentralisation, going so far as to suggest the abolition of the office of Governor-General and the construction of five presidencies, with capitals at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Agra, and Lahore. Mr. Bright proposed also a large number of remedial measures, and the issuing of a proclamation offering a general amnesty, maintaining the sacredness of adoption, and announcing complete equality in all religions. Again, in the same session we find him speaking with great force and eloquence in defence of a despatch of Lord Ellenborough's condemning the proclamation in which Lord Canning had threatened something like confiscation to the talookdars, or landowners, of Oude. Next year he took up the question of Indian finance, and spoke very earnestly on Sir Charles Wood's proposal to raise a loan of 5,000,000*l.* for the Indian Exchequer. He dwelt on the alarming financial condition of India, and on the great and increasing responsibilities which this country was undertaking with regard to it, and after enlarging upon the vast and increasing expenditure, he asked what was the end to which things must come.

But the period was approaching in which Parliamentary reform was about to occupy the first place among English political questions, although as long as Lord Palmerston lived it was little likely to be brought forward in any practical form. To no politician more than to Mr. Bright was due the wide spirit in

which it was to be ultimately treated. In January, 1865, in a speech to his constituents at Birmingham, he sounded the note of reform in a manner which all could understand, and which neither Government nor Opposition could afford to neglect. "I speak," he said, "out of no hostility to any class or any institution. That man who proposes to exclude permanently five millions of his countrymen from the right which the Constitution makes sacred in his eyes—I say that is the man who separates Englishmen into two nations, and makes it impossible that we should be wholly or permanently a contented people." When Parliament was dissolved in the following July, Parliamentary reform was the question for the country, and Mr. Bright's speech at his unopposed nomination was in reality a complete statement of the case in favour of such a measure as was introduced next year. Then, on October 18, Lord Palmerston died, and was succeeded in the Premiership by Earl Russell. Early in the next session Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the House of Commons, brought forward the Government Reform Bill. The debates which followed were made memorable by the speeches delivered against the Bill by Mr. Horsman and Mr. Lowe, to whose arguments and assertions Mr. Bright especially continued to address himself, both in the House of Commons and out of doors. The occasion was worthy of the contest; for though the immediate proposal was merely the enfranchisement of some four hundred thousand voters, of very much the same class as many of those who already possessed the franchise, still no careful watcher of events could doubt that now, once for all, was to be settled the question of democratic reform in England.

After passing its second reading, the Bill was ultimately wrecked, on a motion by Lord Dunkellin, supported by those Liberals whom Mr. Bright designated as refugees in "the cave of Adullam." Lord Russell's Ministry resigned, and Lord Derby again resumed the nominal Premiership of a Government of which Mr. Disraeli was the guiding spirit. It was under his guidance that the moderate Reform Bill introduced by the Conservatives, in recognition of the popular demand, was suddenly transformed into giving household suffrage pure and simple in all boroughs. Mr. Bright's part in the whole affair was that of the authorised spokesman and champion of the working-classes, whom he felt it a duty to defend against the too indiscriminate indictments of Mr. Lowe.

hen the day came for the Bill to be read a third time in the House of Commons, Mr. Lowe made a speech accepting the inevitable, and putting in his famous plea for the necessity of compulsory education, on the ground that, now the working-classes were to sway the polls, "we must induce our masters to learn their letters."

In the general election which ensued, the triumph of the Liberals at the poll rendered the return of their party to power inevitable, and Mr. Gladstone was unanimously recognised as their leader. In forming his Cabinet, Mr. Gladstone first wished that Mr. Bright should become Secretary of State for India; but he shrank from so arduous a post, on the ground of the state of his health, and finally accepted that of President of the Board of Trade. But his health gave way, and in December, 1870, he resigned, to re-enter the Cabinet on its reconstruction in 1873, as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Meanwhile, however, Mr. Bright had had opportunity of proving his qualities as an adviser of the Crown. The large majority with which Mr. Gladstone took office was pledged to the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. Mr. Bright's speech on the second reading (March 19) was generally considered at the time to be one of his greatest efforts, and it will probably continue to rank among them in the minds of future readers of his speeches. The Bill passed the Commons by large majorities, and in the House of Lords, in spite of the eloquence of the Bishop of Peterborough, the second reading was carried by 179 to 146. But Mr. Bright's desire to help Ireland, and remove the source of many of her troubles, was not satisfied by the removal of the last remains of Protestant ascendancy. In conjunction with his friends he set himself to prepare public opinion for dealing with the land question. Early in 1870, addressing his constituents at Birmingham, Mr. Bright gave general expression to the principles which were to underlie the Government policy towards Ireland in the ensuing session. As regards this first Land Bill, however, a breakdown in health in the early part of 1870 prevented Mr. Bright from taking any share in the debates. He gave his name to certain incomplete "purchase clauses," which represented a part, and only a part, of a policy that he wished to see incorporated in the Bill, and which were all that a division of opinion in the Cabinet enabled him to introduce.

It was about this period, too, that Mr.

Bright took that active part in public affairs which he had occupied for so many years. As an orator, however, his powers continued unsurpassed, and in his annual address to his constituents he threw out suggestive hints as to the course to be pursued, and the ends arrived at by younger and more active workers in the Liberal camp. He had been greatly moved by the death of Cobden, in 1865, in 1870, as we have said, a second attack of his old illness compelled him to withdraw for a period from public life; and in 1878 a fresh blow fell upon him in the sudden death of his second wife, a daughter of Wm. Leatham, of Wakefield, whom he had married in 1847. During the latter period of his life—from 1870 onwards—his speeches, with a few noteworthy exceptions, had too much the character of political retrospects. When, however, there was an attack to be made upon what he considered an abuse, or upon a course of policy which he believed to be disastrous, Mr. Bright retained much of his old fire; and his speeches at Birmingham, in 1877, against the idea of a Turkish alliance, and afterwards against the Afghan and Zulu wars, were as animated and as effective as those of his best days. When the general election of 1880 returned Mr. Gladstone to power with an immense majority, Mr. Bright again entered his Cabinet, on the understanding that his share was to be consultative, and that a *minimum* of departmental work was to be expected from him. He remained in office until the middle of 1882, and resigned, as our readers will remember, on account of the bombardment of the Alexandrian forts, his long devotion to the cause of peace not permitting him to form part of a Government that was entering upon war. During these two years he frequently spoke in defence of the Government measures, especially of the Irish Land Bill of 1881, while he did not shrink from supporting, on the other hand, the coercive measures which it was found necessary to apply to Ireland, and the means which were taken by the House of Commons to maintain its own independence and efficiency against the obstructionists.

In the years that immediately followed his resignation Mr. Bright did not appear very frequently before the public. There were, however, some notable exceptions in 1883—in March, when, after having been elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, he delivered the customary address to students; and in June, when the town

of Birmingham celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his political connection with that borough. At Glasgow Mr. Bright admitted that he had had but little to do with Universities; and his speech, to tell the truth, had little to do with University studies: but it was interesting in itself, and interesting indirectly, since exactly one hundred years before 1883 the post of Lord Rector had been held by another illustrious public man, and another great master of English, Edmund Burke. The ceremonial at Birmingham had a more strictly personal interest, for, of the vast crowds that lined the streets—and it was said that they numbered several hundreds of thousands—there was hardly a man or a woman who did not look upon the great popular representative with feelings of deep affection as well as of admiration. Two years later, in the election of 1885, before the old party lines had become confused by the Irish question, Mr. Bright's seat was attacked by Lord Randolph Churchill, that being the first occasion in which Birmingham was broken up into several separate constituencies; but though the invader made a good fight, he was easily defeated, and in the general election of 1886 Mr. Bright was returned unopposed. By that time, however, he had taken the important step on which all his subsequent political action depended. He had declined, in the strongest possible way, to follow Mr. Gladstone in his advocacy of Home Rule for Ireland.

This decision of Mr. Bright's was, undoubtedly, of immense importance to the Unionist cause. It is true that his speaking days were nearly over—that, owing to his advanced age, he could not be counted on as an active soldier in the struggle which then began; but the weight of his authority made him a most valuable ally. In the one important speech delivered in 1886—that in which he thanked his constituents for electing him (July 1)—he recalled with just pride his own long services in the cause of "justice to Ireland;" he pointed out that for twenty-three years before Mr. Gladstone took up the Irish question he himself had been urging remedial legislation, and he rightly claimed no small share of whatever credit is to attach to the Liberal party for disestablishing the Irish Church and for reforming the Irish Land Laws. From the time of the first announcement of a Home Rule policy, down to the last months of his life, Mr. Bright continued to remind the country that his opinion was unchanged. He

only spoke once—at the Liberal Unionist banquet to Lord Hartington, in August, 1887—partly because speaking on any exciting topic was more than his strength would permit, and partly, as he said in a letter dated December 7, 1888, because he could not bear to attack his old friend and leader. Though Mr. Bright felt strongly, down to the close of his life, about Mr. Gladstone's recent political conduct, the two statesmen resumed their friendly personal relations, and in the course of Mr. Bright's last illness affectionate messages passed between them.

It can easily be supposed that Mr. Bright did not thus separate himself from the majority of the party for which he had worked so long without the deepest pain. He found himself opposed, not only by his own colleagues in the Ministry and in the House of Commons, but by many, though not by any means all, of his brother Quakers; by his personal friends, and even by members of his own family; and this, to a man whose main interests had been political, was a cause of sincere grief. But he saw no help for it—he could not turn round upon the convictions of a lifetime; and he remained "constant as the northern star" to the traditions of Liberalism as it was always understood up to the month of December, 1885. "I am," he wrote in one of his later letters, "and always have been, against having two Parliaments in the United Kingdom, and, so long as the Liberal and Gladstone policy is in favour of two Parliaments, I must follow my own judgment and conscience, and not the voice of any party leader."

His last illness was immediately occasioned by a chill taken on a night journey from London to Rochdale in May, 1888. His splendid constitution and regular habits of life enabled him to rally more than once, and in August he was once more able to take exercise out of doors. During the winter, however, he had several relapses, the malady from which he suffered—diabetes—making progress as his strength decreased; but up to within a few days of his death it seemed possible that he might again rally. Early in March, however, he caught fresh cold, which attacked his lungs and aggravated his constitutional disorder, and on March 27 he passed away quite peacefully, surrounded by his family. According to his wish, he was buried in the Friends' Burial Ground at Rochdale; but his desire that his funeral should be strictly private could not be equally observed. The

respect and affection with which he was regarded was shown in the vast crowds who assembled to pay him the last honours. The Queen and various members of the Royal Family were specially represented, the leading political bodies in all parts of the country sent delegates, members of all parties in the

House of Commons testified by their presence of their admiration for their colleague; whilst in the neighbouring towns and villages business was suspended, and the inhabitants in thousands lined the road or followed the simple funeral procession.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 1st, at Nice, aged 66, **Henry John Reuben Dawson-Damer, K.P.**, third Earl of Portarlington, Viscount Carland, and Baron Dawson, a representative peer for Ireland. He was born Sept. 5, 1822, the only son of the Hon. Henry Dawson-Damer (second son of the first Earl of Portarlington, by Lady Caroline Stuart, his wife, daughter of John, third Earl of Bute, K.G., the famous Prime Minister), was educated in the University of Oxford, and succeeded his uncle, John, second Earl of Portarlington, Dec. 28, 1846. He married, Sept. 2, 1847, Lady Alexandra Octavia Maria Vane, daughter of the third Marquess of Londonderry, K.G., and was left a widower Jan. 15, 1874. On the same date, at Glebe House, Stoke Newington, aged 65, **William Henry Monk, Mus. Doc.**, of King's College, London, one of the editors of "Hymns Ancient and Modern." On the 3rd, at Gorton Hall, near Manchester, aged 68, **Richard Peacock**, son of Ralph Peacock, of Bank House, Swaledale, Yorkshire. Educated at Leeds Grammar School; married, in 1838, Hannah, daughter of John Henry Crowther, of Leeds. Became head of the engineering firm of Beyer, Peacock and Co., of Manchester; was elected as a Liberal for the Gorton Division of Lancashire in 1885, and retained the seat at the subsequent election. On the same date, at The Bury, Ashwell, Hertfordshire, aged 78, **Edward King Fordham, D.L., F.R.S.S.** He took a prominent interest in his neighbourhood, both as magistrate and politician, as well as in the work of the Central Chamber of Agriculture. On the 5th, in Grosvenor Street, aged 63, **Major-General D. Nassau Lees (LL.D. of Dublin, Ph.D. Berlin)**, son of the Rev. Sir Harcourt Lees, second Baronet. He entered the Bengal Army in 1845. A large number of works on Persian and other Oriental languages were edited by him. At different times he had been Principal of the Madras College, Calcutta, Examiner in Mohammedan and Persian, Translator to the Government of India, and for many years was part proprietor of the *Times of India*. On the same date, at Rievaulx, Tunbridge Wells, aged 84, **Louisa**, widow of William, second Baron Feversham, and mother of the Earl of Feversham, daughter of George, eighth Earl of Galloway, by Lady Jane Paget, sister of the first Marquess of Anglesey. Also on the same date, at Old Church, near Limerick, aged 76, the **Hon. Mrs. O'Brien (Eleanor)**, widow of the Hon. Robert O'Brien, brother of Lucius, thirteenth Lord Inchiquin, and the eldest daughter of Sir Aubrey De Vere, second Baronet, of Curragh Chase, in the county of Limerick. On the 7th, in Dublin, aged 74, **George Johnston, M.D., F.R.C.S., F.R.G.S.**, Fellow and ex-President of the King's and Queen's College of Physicians, Ireland. He was the son of the late Andrew Johnston, a celebrated army surgeon in his day. On the same date, at Kineton House, Warwick, **The Dowager Lady Willoughby de Broke**, daughter of Major-General Taylor, of Oggwell, Devonshire; married, in 1842, the ninth Lord Willoughby de Broke, who died in 1862. Also on the same date, at New York, aged 86, **John Ericsson**, by birth a Swede, the inventor of the screw propeller and calorific engine. On the 8th, in Southwell Gardens, aged 73, **General Alexander Maxwell, C.B.**, Colonel 84th Regt., but commanded the 46th Regt. during the Crimean campaign, 1854-5, son of William Maxwell, of Dargavel, Renfrewshire; married daughter of Colonel Burrows, K.H., Boughton Court, co. Somerset; created C.B., 1875. On the 9th, at Cairo, aged 65, **Mary Whately**, daughter of Dr. Wm. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin. She was the foundress and head of the well-known English Mission schools there, and the author of several works. On the 11th, at Longford Castle, near Salisbury, aged 73, **Sir Jacob Pleydell-Bouverie**, fourth Earl of Radnor, Viscount Folkestone, &c., Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Wiltshire; educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford; married, 1840, Lady Mary A. F., third daughter of the first Earl of Verulam. On the 12th, at Naples, aged 73, **Sir William Foster Stawell, K.C.M.G.**, Lieutenant-Governor of the colony of Victoria. He was son of Mr. Jonas Stawell, of Old Court, in the county of Cork, by Anne Elizabeth, his wife, daughter of the Right Rev. William Foster, D.D., Bishop of Cork and Ross; was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the Bar

at King's Inns, Dublin, in 1839. He was Chancellor of the University of Melbourne 1881 to 1882; Attorney-General of Victoria, 1851 to 1857; and Chief Justice of Victoria, 1857 to 1886, when he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor. He received the honour of knighthood in 1857, and was made Knight-Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1886. He married, in 1856, Mary Frances Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. William Pomeroy Greene, Royal Navy. On the 18th, in Paris, aged 68, Signor Tamberlik, a once famous tenor singer. On the same date, aged 62, Frederick Hawley, appointed in 1886 librarian of the Shakespeare Memorial Library at Stratford-on-Avon, a post which he held three years. He was a son of Captain Hawley, of the 51st King's Own. He was trained for the law, and admitted solicitor in 1852, at that time being secretary to the Great Eastern Steamship Company. He subsequently adopted the stage as a profession, and played under the name of Haywell. He was five seasons with Phelps and Greenwood at Sadler's Wells, many years with Charles Calvert at the Prince's, Manchester, during the period of the famous Shakespearian revivals, and was the last manager for John Knowles at the Theatre Royal, Manchester. He was appointed first librarian of the Shakespeare Memorial, and devoted himself to the duties with such zeal and industry that the library attained proportions that few anticipated it would reach in so short a space of time. His learning and courtesy enabled him to make a friend of every Shakespearian scholar who visited the Memorial, and, as a result, many valuable contributions were received by the library. Only six weeks before his death he completed a manuscript catalogue of all the known editions of Shakespeare's plays in every language, which will remain as a monument of his perseverance and industry, and will prove invaluable to the Memorial Library. On the 16th, at Bournemouth, aged 72, the Hon. George Skene Duff, second son of the Hon. Sir Alexander Duff, of Delgaty (second son of the third Earl of Fife); entered the army as cornet in the Horse Guards Blue, 1836, but sold out in the following year, was *attaché* at the Embassies at Paris and Vienna; sat as a Liberal for the Elgin Burghs, 1847-57; Lord-Lieutenant of Elginshire, 1866-71; raised to the rank of an Earl's son in 1857. On the same date, within four months of completing his 100th year, Commander William Blackmore Noble, R.N. He had in his younger days seen much service, and had landed the guns for Sir Arthur Wellesley's expedition at Montego Bay. Also on the same date, at Mentone, aged 64, the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, M.A., D.D., of Edinburgh, Grunfield Lecturer in the University of Oxford, and formerly vicar of Loders, Dorset, a writer on Jewish History. On the 18th, in London, aged 66, Colonel George Palmer Evelyn, F.R.G.S., of Hartley Manor, Dartford, late of the Rifle Brigade, with which he served in the Crimean War. He was the son of George Evelyn, of Wotton, Surrey. On the 20th, at Kingstown, Dublin, aged 87, Harriett Butler, widow of the Very Rev. Richard Butler, Dean of Clonmacnois and Rector of Trim, co. Meath, second daughter of Richard Lovell Edgeworth, by his fourth wife, and half-sister of Maria Edgeworth, the novelist. On the 21st, at Oscott College, aged 82, the Rev. William Bernard, Archbishop Ullathorne. After long and distinguished services to the Church in Australia, he was recalled to become Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, and on his resignation of the see the title of Archbishop was conferred upon him by the Pope. On the 22nd, in South Kensington, aged 82, Robert Duncombe Shafto, of Whitworth Park, Durham, eldest son of Robert Eden Duncombe, M.P., of Whitworth Park; married, 1838, Charlotte Rosa, daughter of Mr. Wm. Baring; sat as a Conservative for North Durham, 1847-68. On the 24th, at Sevenoaks, aged 71, Joseph Woolley, M.A., LL.D., late Director of Education for the Admiralty, and Inspector of Schools, formerly Principal of the School of Mathematics and Naval Construction at Portsmouth. A Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, he was for many years in Holy Orders, but relinquished them on the passing of the Clergy Relief Act. On the 25th, at Lyons, aged 72, the Hon. Charles Hugh Lindsay, C.B., son of the twenty-fourth Earl of Crawford. Served with the Grenadier Guards in Canada, and in the Crimean campaign, had held appointments in Ireland under successive Lord-Lieutenants; sat as a Liberal-Conservative for Abingdon, 1865-74; married, 1851, Emily Anne, daughter of Very Rev. the Hon. Montagu Browne. On the same date, at Umballa, aged 61, Colonel Henry de Grey Warter, R.H.A., eldest son of the late Rev. John Wood Warter, B.A., Vicar of West Tarring, Sussex, and grandson maternally of Robert Southey, the poet. The Wartons of Cruck Meote, in Shropshire, of whom Colonel Warter was a descendant, were from a very ancient family seated at Stableford. On the 26th, Lady Lushington (Eliza Hannah), daughter of Mr. John Shelley. She married, in 1863, as his second wife, Sir Henry Lushington, third Baronet, of Aspenden Hall, in the county

of Hertford. On the 27th, at Gattonside, near Melrose, aged 70, Lord Fraser, Judge of the Court of Session in Scotland. He was called to the Scotch Bar in 1843, and was made a Queen's Counsel in 1881. The same year he was appointed a Judge of the Court of Session in Scotland, with the courtesy-title of Lord Fraser, and Lord Ordinary in Exchequer causes. On the 28th, at Bickley, aged 44, Charles Henry Bennet Patey, C.B., son of Admiral Patey, C.M.G.; third Secretary of the Post-office, the general superintendence of the telegraphic service having been specially his charge since 1877. On the 29th, at Tulloch Lodge, Ross-shire, aged 50, Colonel Davidson, of Tulloch, who was the head of one of the oldest families in the north of Scotland. On the same date, aged 81, William George Howard, the eighth Earl of Carlisle, third son of the sixth Earl, by Georgiana, eldest daughter and coheir of the fifth Duke of Devonshire. Educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and entered Holy Orders, holding the living of Londesborough forty-five years; succeeded to the title, 1864. On the same date, aged 87, Charles Cowan, of Logan House, Mid Lothian; sat as a Radical for Edinburgh, 1874-1882. The son of the late Alexander Cowan, of Edinburgh, paper manufacturer; married Charlotte, the daughter of Duncan Cowan. On 31st, aged 30, Walter Hungerford Pollen, Lieut. R.E., in command of the survey party in the Lushai Expedition. He had served in Egypt, and on Lord Ripon's staff in India.

APRIL.

Colonel Robertson-Eustace.—Colonel Robert Jameson-Eustace Robertson-Eustace, commanding the 3rd and 4th Battalions, South Staffordshire Regiment, died on the 1st, aged 61, at Folkestone. He entered the service in the 60th Rifles, with which regiment he saw much service in the Punjab, including the siege of Mooltan and the capture of the citadel, at the battle of Goojerat, the pursuit of the Sikh army, and the expulsion of the Afghans beyond the Khyber Pass (medal with two clasps). In 1849 he was in the Yusufzai Expedition; and, in 1850, in the forcing of Kohat Pass (medal with clasp). He served also in the Indian Mutiny campaign and the Red River Expedition. Colonel Eustace was son of Mr. Robert Robertson, Advocate Sheriff-Substitute of Stirlingshire, by Alicia Catharine, his wife, eldest daughter of the Rev. Charles Eustace, who claimed the viscounty of Baltinglass. He assumed by Royal licence, in 1875, the additional surname of Eustace, as heir-general of his maternal family. He married, April 9, 1868, Lady Katharine Legge, daughter of the fourth Earl of Dartmouth.

Dr. Kennedy.—Benjamin Hall Kennedy was born in 1804, at Summer Hill, near Birmingham, in which town his father—himself known as an author of several poems—held an incumbency as well as the second mastership of King Edward's School. After a short stay at this school, Benjamin Kennedy was removed to Shrewsbury, at that time under the charge of the famous Dr. Butler. On leaving Shrewsbury, in 1824, he entered

at St. John's College, Cambridge, and his University life was more than usually successful. In his first year he gained the Pitt scholarship and the Browne's prizes for Greek and Latin odes; in the next year Browne's prize for epigrams; the Porson prize in 1823, 1824, and 1826; and—when he had already taken his degree—in 1828 the Members' prize for Latin prose, "*De Origine Scripturæ Alphabeticæ*." In those times no one could enter for Classical honours until he had passed through the Mathematical Tripos. Kennedy, though the subject may have had very little interest for him, did respectably in mathematics. He passed 28th among the Senior Optimes. Having thus won his right to compete for Classical honours, Kennedy came out at the head of the First Class, and then added the Senior Chancellor's medal to his other University prizes.

In 1828, the year after he took his degree, he was elected Fellow and appointed Classical Lecturer at his college. He shortly afterwards took Orders, and was appointed an assistant-master at Harrow, at that time under the headship of Dr. (afterwards Archbishop) Longley.

In 1836 Dr. Butler was appointed to the See of Lichfield, and his old pupil, Kennedy, succeeded him as Headmaster of Shrewsbury, where he had been head boy at the age of sixteen. During his long life his energy is described as unflagging, but the thirty years during which he held the Headmastership of Shrewsbury are those on which his fame as a teacher mainly rests. Year by year from that school, the smallest of the public schools,

and rarely numbering over 180 boys, he sent up to the Universities a succession of pupils who were distinguished by their ability and scholarship.

While he was at Shrewsbury he was made Prebendary of Lichfield in 1841, was appointed Preacher for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1857, and Select Preacher in his University in 1860. From 1865 to 1868 he held the incumbency of West Felton, Shropshire, and in 1867, on his resignation of the headmastership of Shrewsbury, was appointed by the Crown to the Regius Professorship of Greek at Cambridge, together with a canonry at Ely. Within a few years he was elected a Member of the Council of the University, was nominated Lady Margaret's Preacher, and was elected an honorary Fellow of his old College.

Of his literary activity and love of scholarship out of school he gave numerous proofs. Perhaps the best known of his books will be the "Latin Primer" and "Public School Latin Grammar," which he compiled at the request of a conference of headmasters, and which have been adopted in almost every school of note in the kingdom. The vexation at the compulsory use of the Primer in public schools was so loud that it found its way into the Press; but after a short experience teachers and scholars recognised the great advance it was upon the old Eton and King Edward's grammars. The larger work—the "Public School Latin Grammar"—has been pronounced by competent writers to be the most complete book on the subject ever printed.

Dr. Kennedy contributed largely to the well-known volume of Latin and Greek composition produced at Shrewsbury, and known as "Sabrine Corolla," of which the first edition appeared in 1850. He also wrote "The Psalter in English Verse," translated Aristophanes's *Birds* into English verse, edited a school edition of Virgil, and wrote a collection of Greek, Latin, and English poetry under the title of "Between Whiles." Among the works he wrote while Professor at Cambridge may be mentioned translations of the *Agamemnon* and the *King CEdypus* (both in verse), and of Plato's "Theætetus."

Dr. Kennedy married, in 1831, Janet, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Caird, by whom he leaves a family. He took a keen interest in politics. Throughout his life he was a Liberal, and was, indeed, considered by many of his friends to be a Liberal of a very advanced order; but he refused to follow the main

body of the party when Mr. Gladstone declared in favour of Home Rule, and was among the first to join the ranks of the Liberal Unionists. In his later years at the University he was a good conversationalist, full of anecdote, a witty man, generous, and hospitable. He was a strong supporter of the movement for admitting women to degrees, and regarded with pride the established success of Newnham and Girton Colleges, towards which he did much to contribute. He was the Senior Doctor in Divinity of the University, having been admitted to that degree by Royal mandate as far back as 1836.

Dr. Kennedy died at Torquay, on the 5th, after a short illness; but in conformity with his own wishes he was buried at Cambridge.

• King John of Abyssinia first came into notice about 1868, when, as Prince Kassai of Tigré, he gave assistance to the British expedition against King Theodore, to whom, after the latter's defeat by our troops, he succeeded as Negus. By the help of the arms left by us he was able to overthrow Goobassie, King Theodore's son, the most formidable of his rivals, whom he cast into prison and deprived of his eyesight. A few months later Prince Kassai was crowned by the Abuna, or Archbishop, under the style of King Johannes, or John. His next act was to pick a quarrel with the Egyptians on the ownership of the provinces of Bogos and Hamasen. War speedily broke out, and although Walad Michael, Prince of Bogos, had at first sided with King John, his shifting to the other side did not ultimately affect the result of the war. In 1876 the Egyptians sustained a crushing defeat, leaving, it was said, 10,000 men upon the field. In the following year he brought to terms his other opponent, Prince Menelek of Shoa, who eventually waived his claims to the crown. With General Gordon, who came as Egyptian Governor-General of the Soudan, he remained on a friendly footing; and when, at a later period, Gordon was shut up at Khartoum, it was suggested that aid might be sent to him by the help of King John. The occupation of Massowah by the Italians, and the subsequent hostilities, ending in the complete defeat of the Abyssinian troops, weakened King John's hold upon the people. Menelek, taking advantage of this change of feeling, disputed the orders of his superior, and ultimately broke out into open rebellion, defeating John's forces, and killing their leader in a battle fought on the 6th, on the Soah.

H.R.H. The Duchess of Cambridge.

—The Princess Augusta Wilhelmina Louisa was the third daughter of the Landgrave Frederick of Hesse-Cassel, and was born on the 25th of July, 1797. Her early life was passed in her father's Court, at a period when the whole of Europe was agitated and convulsed by the conquests of Napoleon. Amid the dynastic and other changes which occurred, the Landgrave assumed, in 1803, the title of Elector of Hesse-Cassel.

On the 7th of May, 1818, the Princess Augusta was married to the Duke of Cambridge, the seventh son of King George III. and Queen Charlotte. The marriage took place at Hesse-Cassel, but it was renewed in this country in the following month. Contrary, however, to the practice generally observed in marriages of members of the Royal family, this second ceremony was celebrated privately, having been deferred to the 1st of June in consequence of the ill-health of Queen Charlotte. The Royal bridegroom had led a somewhat more adventurous life than most of his brothers. Educated at Kew, and afterwards at Göttingen, he visited the Court of Prussia to perfect his knowledge of military tactics, and in 1798 was appointed Colonel in the Hanoverian army. He served as a volunteer, first under his brother, the Duke of York, during the early part of the campaign of 1793 in Flanders, and then with Marshal Freytag. Whilst serving with the Hanoverian troops, the Duke was twice wounded, and once, for a short time, taken prisoner. In 1798, by steady promotion, he reached the grade of Lieutenant-General in the Hanoverian service, and three years later (Nov. 1801) he was created a peer of the United Kingdom, at the same time that his elder brother, Prince Augustus Frederick, was created Duke of Sussex.

In 1803 the Duke was transferred from the Hanoverian to the British service, and was appointed to the command of the King's German Legion, destined for the relief of Hanover, which was then menaced by the French armies. This appointment he afterwards resigned to Count Walmoden, who surrendered his arms. In 1813 his Royal Highness was advanced to the rank of Field-Marshal, and subsequently he was appointed Governor-General of Hanover, a post which he filled for many years to the satisfaction of the country. It was in the early days of this second sojourn upon the Continent that his Royal Highness met with the Princess who afterwards became his wife.

In 1819 the Duchess gave birth to a son, the present Duke of Cambridge, Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief; in 1822 to a daughter, the Princess Augusta, who in 1843 married the Hereditary Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and to the Princess Mary, born in 1833, married in 1866 to the Prince and Duke of Teck. All the children were born at Hanover.

On the return of the Duke and Duchess to England they were extremely popular with all classes of the community. The Duke was a zealous and indefatigable supporter of all our great public charities, and was a warm advocate of their claims, and the Duchess associated herself with many of these undertakings. They resided for the greater part of the year at "The Cottage," Kew, and after the Duke's death, in 1850, the Duchess and her family divided their time between Kew and St. James's Palace, where she occupied a suite of rooms. These, for some years prior to her death, which took place on the 6th, she never quitted, but only a few days before her death she gave a dinner-party to celebrate her son's 70th birthday.

The Rev. Sir F. Gore Ouseley, Bart.

—Sir Frederick Gore Ouseley, Canon of Hereford Cathedral, founder and Warden of St. Michael's College, Tenbury, and long Professor of Music in the University of Oxford, died at Hereford, on the 6th. Born in London in 1825, son of the Right Hon. Sir Gore Ouseley, the eminent Orientalist and Ambassador at the Courts of Persia and St. Petersburg, he succeeded to his father's title in 1844. He graduated at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1846. In 1849 he was ordained, and appointed to the curacy of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, which he held until 1851. In 1850 he took the degree of Bachelor of Music at Oxford, and four years later he became Doctor of Music. Upon the death of Sir Henry R. Bishop, in 1855, he was appointed to the Professorship of Music at Oxford, and in the same year was ordained priest, and appointed precentor of Hereford Cathedral. In the next year he became Vicar of St. Michael's College, Tenbury, which he had erected at his own expense, for the education of choristers, and where he collected a valuable library of music. Sir Frederick Ouseley composed two oratorios ("St. Polycarp" and "Hagar"), also many anthems and pieces for the organ, and arranged (with E. G. Monk) "The Psalter" for chanting. He also composed several glees and songs. His "Treatise on Harmony," "Treatise on

Counterpoint," and "Treatise on Musical Form and General Composition," have become recognised text-books. He was unmarried, and the baronetcy expired with him.

M. Chevreul.—M. Chevreul, the great chemist, who on the 31st of August, 1888, attained the age of 102, breathed his last on the 9th, in his house in the Jardin des Plantes, Paris. Michel Eugène Chevreul was born in 1786, at Angers, where his father had a high reputation as a medical practitioner. He studied at the École Centrale at Angers, which he left at the age of seventeen to enter the chemical works at Paris. In 1810 he was selected by M. Vauquelin, Professor of Chemistry at the Jardin des Plantes, as his assistant. Three years later he was appointed to the chemical chair at the Lycée Charlemagne. He was afterwards selected as superintendent of the dyeworks and lectures on chemistry at the Gobelins Carpet Factory. This combination of practical work with the scientific study of the special processes in which he was engaged led to most important results. He recorded his experiments and observations in a paper published in 1829, entitled, "On the Law of the Simultaneous Contrast of Colours and on the Matching of Coloured Objects considered according to this Law in its Relations to Painting." M. Chevreul was an active and laborious student, and it is impossible to enumerate his discoveries and the papers in which he published them. One of his most important works was his "Chemical Researches on Fatty Bodies of Animal Origin." It marked an important advance in organic chemistry and the industries dependent upon it. He expressed in it his ideas on the association of fatty bodies to ethers, and gave the first exact theory of saponification. It was this theory which afterwards led him to the discovery of stearine candles.

The Society for the Encouragement of National Industry, in recognition of his discoveries, awarded him, in 1852, the prize of 12,000 fr. founded by the Marquis d'Argenteuil. In reference to this, M. Dumas, the Professor of Chemistry at the Sorbonne, said that the prize gave expression to the opinion of Europe on works which were a model to all chemists, and that it was by hundreds of millions that it would be necessary to enumerate the results due to the discoveries of M. Chevreul.

In 1830 M. Chevreul succeeded to M. Vauquelin as Professor of Practical

Chemistry at the Jardin des Plantes. He was a Member of the Royal Society of London, President of the Agricultural Society of France, Director of the Museum of Natural History, Member of the Academy of Sciences, and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour.

The centenary of M. Chevreul was the occasion of a great demonstration in Paris, at which he was present. Since that time he lived very quietly in his official house. It was his custom to drive daily to see the progress made in the erection of the Eiffel Tower. The actual death of his son, M. Henri Chevreul, was concealed from him, but he evidently suspected that his son was dead. For a week after the death he showed signs of anxiety, but he then ceased to refer to the subject. Just a week before his own death, when he returned from his daily drive to the Eiffel Tower, he showed signs of great weakness. He could not go upstairs to his apartments on the second storey, and had to be taken up. The doctor was called the same evening, and announced that the end was approaching. He gradually became weaker. An attempt was made, but in vain, to make him drink a cup of milk. He sank gradually, without pain, till he quietly breathed his last.

Father Damien.—Joseph Damien de Venster was born at Ninde, near Louvain, on 8rd January, 1841. On his nineteenth birthday his father took him to see his brother, who was preparing for the priesthood, and left him there to dine. Young Joseph decided that here was the opportunity for taking the step he had long desired, and when his father came back, he told him that he wished to return home no more, and that it would be better thus to miss the pain of farewell. The father reluctantly consented, and they parted at the station. Some time later, when all was settled, Joseph revisited his home, and received his mother's blessing and approval. His brother had long desired to undertake mission work in the South Seas, but when the time came he was prostrated by fever, and forbidden to go. Joseph, although his religious education was not complete, surreptitiously offered himself, and he was ultimately accepted by the Superior of the "Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary." For some years his work lay among the various islands of the South Pacific, and finally he reached Molokai in 1873, in order to work among the leper colony of that place. Regardless of all danger

and warnings, he resolutely worked on, and with his own hands laboured at the building of church and schools, visiting the sick, and spreading amongst them the habits of cleanliness and self respect they had forgotten or had never known. In 1886 he was first tainted with the

terrible disease, but he refused to quit his post, and, in spite of constant and often acute suffering and severe prostration, he pursued his work, finally succumbing on the 10th, at Kalawao, the chief place of the leper settlement.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 1st, at Idsworth Park, Hants, in his 85th year, **Sir Jervoise Clarke-Jervoise, Bart.** He was the eldest son of the Rev. Sir Samuel Jervoise; created a Baronet in 1813, and succeeded in 1852. From 1857 to 1868 he represented South Hants in Parliament. He married, June 15, 1829, Georgiana, youngest daughter of Mr. George Nesbitt Thompson, and was left a widower Feb. 25, 1873. On the 2nd, at Gibraltar, aged 59, **William Bayne Rankin**, of Eaton Square, and of Hoddlesden, Lancashire, well-known in connection with the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society and other philanthropic movements. On the 3rd, at Ryde, Isle of Wight, aged 80, **General Edmund Richard Jeffreys, C.B.**, son of Rev. John Jeffreys. Educated at Westminster and Sandhurst; entered 88th Regt. 1825, Lieut.-Colonel 1854; served in the Crimea, where he was wounded; married, 1844, Mary, daughter of Colonel P. Vans-Agnew, C.B., 1885. On the same date, at Chiddingstone Castle, Kent, **Colonel Henry Lorrien Streatfeild, J.P. and D.L.**, High Sheriff in 1882. He was born Aug. 2, 1825, the eldest son of the late Mr. Henry Streatfeild, of Chiddingstone, J.P. and D.L., by Maria, his wife, daughter of Mr. Magens Dorrien Magens, of Hammerwood Lodge, Sussex. He was formerly Captain 1st Life Guards, and subsequently Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding West Kent Yeomanry Cavalry. He married, Dec. 19, 1854, Marion Henrietta, youngest daughter of Mr. Oswald Smith, of Blendon Hall, Kent. On the 4th, at Nice, aged 40, **The Most Hon. John Henry Wellington Graham Loftus**, Earl and Marquess of Ely, Viscount and Baron Loftus in Ireland, and also Baron Loftus in the United Kingdom, and a Baronet. Born Nov. 20, 1849, the only son of John Henry, third Marquess, by his wife, daughter of Mr. James Joseph Hope-Vere, of Craigie, and Blackwood, N.B., a Lady of the Bedchamber to her Majesty. He was educated at Harrow and Oxford; succeeded to the title July 15, 1857, and married, Dec. 9, 1875, Caroline Anne, daughter of Mr. George Cairness, but had no issue. On the 5th, at Burgholme Rectory, near Newbury, aged 61, the Rev. **George Raymond Portal**, honorary canon of Winchester, son of John Portal, of Freefolk Priors, Hampshire. He was a Past Grand Chaplain and a Past Grand Master in Freemasonry. On the same date, at Bournemouth, aged 58, **The Hon. Mrs. Ogilvie-Grant (Eleonora)**, widow of the Hon. George Henry Ogilvie-Grant, brother of the seventh and ninth Earls of Seafield, and fourth daughter of Sir William Gordon Gordon-Cumming, second Baronet. Also on the same date, at Britwell Court, Maidenhead, aged 80, **Samuel Christie-Miller**, of St. James's Place, and Cragentiny, Midlothian, formerly M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyme, and one of her Majesty's Lieutenants for the City of London. The son of the late Thomas Christie, of Broomfield, Essex, he assumed the name of Miller in 1862. On the 6th, at Eccleston Square, aged 86 years, the **Hon. Henry Hanbury-Tracy**, second son of Mr. Charles Hanbury-Tracy, Lord-Lieutenant of Montgomeryshire (who was raised to the Peerage as Baron Sudeley of Toddington, in 1838), by Henrietta Susannah, his wife, the only child and heiress of Henry, eighth Viscount Tracy. He represented Bridgnorth in Parliament, as a Liberal, from 1836 to 1838, and married, Jan. 19, 1841, the Hon. Rosamond Anne Myrtle Shirley, daughter of the late Viscount Tamworth, eldest son of the seventh Earl Ferrers. On the 8th, at Bath, aged 59, **George Arthur Hutton-Croft**, of Aldborough Hall, in the county of York. He was born Aug. 29, 1829, the only son of the late Rev. Thomas Hutton-Croft, of Aldborough Hall, Canon of York and Vicar of Stillington, by Eliza Mary, his wife, sister of Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson, Bart. He was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge; was Lieutenant in the Yorkshire Hussars. He married, Feb. 12, 1867, Catherine Mary, elder daughter and coheiress of Mr. Griffith-Richards, Q.C., and granddaughter of Sir Richard Richards, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and leaves issue. On the 10th, at Middleton-Tyas, Yorkshire, aged 83, **General Henry Ayre**, Colonel of 59th Regiment; entered the army in 1817, rose to rank of General in 1874. On the same date, at Thruxton Cottage, Andover, **Sir Morison Barlow**, third Baronet, of Fir Grove, in the county of Surrey. He was born Nov. 3, 1835, the third son of Sir Robert Barlow, second Baronet, Judge of the Supreme Court of Calcutta (whose father, Sir George Hilary Barlow

G.C.B., Governor of Madras, was created a Baronet in 1803), by his wife, Augusta Louisa, the third daughter of Major-General Seymour, R.A., Governor of St. Lucia. He entered the Bengal Army in 1854, and exchanged to the 9th Lancers in 1870, from which regiment he retired as Captain a few years afterwards. He served in the Indian Mutiny campaign (medal with clasp), and was formerly Commissioner at Zoutpansburg and Waterberg. On the 11th, in Onslow Gardens, aged 89, Mary Anne, Dowager Lady Montague, widow of the first Lord Montague, and daughter of John Marshall, of Headingley, Leeds, and Hallsteads, Cumberland. She was one of the earliest to take up the cause of the education of women. On the same date, in Norfolk Square, Hyde Park, aged 84, General Sir John Fowler Bradford, K.C.B., late of 1st Bengal Cavalry, having served in Afghanistan and in the Punjab campaigns of 1848-9. He was the son of the late Captain Edward Chapman Bradford, H.E.I.C.S., and an Elder Brother of the Trinity House, and married, in 1824, Eliza M. M., second daughter of Sir Wm. Ouseley, LL.D. On the 14th, aged 58, Charles Philip Duffield, J.P., of Marcham Park, Berks, son of the late Mr. Thomas Duffield, M.P. for Abingdon, by Emily, his wife, only child of Mr. George Elwes, of Marcham Park, who inherited that estate from his brother, the celebrated miser, John Elwes. Married, in 1802, Penelope, daughter of Mr. William Graham, of Fizzharris, Bucks. On the 16th, at Wrexham, aged 52, Colonel Charles Henry Browne, C.B., commanding 22nd Regimental District, second son of R. Clayton Browne, of Browne's Hill, Carlou; served with the 97th Foot (West Kent Regiment) in the Crimea, in India, and in the Transvaal. On the same date, in Paris, aged 67, Louis Ulbach, a French novelist and dramatist. Also on the same date, aged 79, Major Andrew Nugent, of The Lodge, Strangford, county Down, J.P. and D.L., late of the 36th Regiment, third son of Lieutenant-Colonel Andrew Nugent, of Portaferry, by the Hon. Selina Vesey, his wife, and derived descent from two ancient Irish families—the Savages, of the Little Ards, and the Nugents, of Dysart. He married, in 1841, Harriet, Viscountess Bangor, second daughter of the sixth Lord Farnham. On the 18th, in Cavendish Square, aged 71, William Townley Mitford, of Pitshill, Sussex, J.P. and D.L. He was born June 29, 1817, only son of the late Mr. Charles Mitford, of Pitshill, Treasurer of Sussex, by Margaret, his wife, daughter of Mr. Richard Greaves Townley, of Fulbourn, M.P.; was educated at Eton, and graduated B.A. at Oriel College, Oxford. He succeeded his father in 1831, and entered Parliament, as member for Midhurst, in 1859, which borough he continued to represent up to 1874. He married, Oct. 7, 1855, the Hon. Margaret Emma, daughter of Lloyd, third Lord Kenyon. On the 19th, in Portland Place, aged 74, Warren De la Rue, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c., son of the late Thomas De la Rue, whom he succeeded as head of the firm. He was distinguished for his scientific knowledge, and had patented a number of inventions, especially in the application of photography to the recording of celestial phenomena. On the same date, at Dunany House, co. Louth, aged 88, Sir Alan Edward Bellingham, M.A., of Castle Bellingham, J.P. and D.L., third Baronet, eldest son of Sir Alan Bellingham, second Baronet, who succeeded to the title (by special remainder) his uncle, Wm. Bellingham, M.P., sometime secretary to Wm. Pitt; married, 1841, Elizabeth, only child of Mr. Henry Clarke, of West Skilbeck House, Lincolnshire. On the 20th, aged 91, John Ynyr Burges, of Parkanaur, in the county of Tyrone, and of Thompe Hall and East Ham, Essex, J.P. and D.L., elder son of the late John Henry Burges, of Wood Park, in the county of Armagh, by Marianne, his wife, daughter and coheirress of Sir Richard Johnston, Bart., of Gilford. He succeeded, in 1838, to the estates of his relative, Margaret, Dowager Countess Poulett, served as High Sheriff of Tyrone in 1829, and married, March 21, 1833, Lady Caroline Clements, daughter of the second Earl of Leitrim, K.P. On the 21st, aged 77, Robert Stirling Newall, D.C.L., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., of Gateshead-on-Tyne, where he had been twice mayor, well-known as an inventor and as the manufacturer of wire-rope, which made submarine telegraphy possible. On the 22nd, at Northgate, Ross, aged 44, Commander the Hon. Walter Hylton-Jolliffe, R.N., third son of the first Baron Hylton, married, 1871, Amy Mary, daughter of William Watt, of Tickton Grange, Beverley. On the 23rd, at Cannes, aged 71, Sir John Walrond Walrond, first Baronet, of Bradfield, Devon, only son of Mr. Benjamin Bowden Dickinson, of Knightshayes (who assumed the name of Walrond in 1845); sat for Tiverton as a Conservative, 1865-8, and unsuccessfully contested the borough in 1874, and again in 1886; married, 1845, Hon. Frances Caroline Hood, younger daughter of Samuel, second Lord Bridport. On the same date, at Rapperswyl, near Zurich, Count Ladislaus Plater, one of the last surviving Polish combatants of 1830. His house was a Polish museum. On the 25th, at Bath, aged 76, Alice Elizabeth, Dowager Lady Wolsley, eldest daughter of Peter

Van Hornrigh, M.P. for Drogheda; married, 1833, Sir Clement Wolseley, fifth Baronet. On the same date, at Holywell Hall, Lincolnshire, aged 78, Charles Thomas Samuel Birch-Reynardson, eldest son of General Thomas Birch, who had assumed the additional name of Reynardson on the death of his father-in-law, Mr. Jacob Reynardson, of Holywell Hall, whose daughter Ethelred he had married. His son married, first, in 1835, Anne, eldest daughter of Mr. Simon Yorke, of Erdig, co. Denbigh; and second, in 1867, Victoria, daughter of Mr. George Dodwell, of Kevinsfort, co. Sligo. On the 29th, aged 89, John Thomas Crossley, a pioneer in the work of public education. A pupil of the late Joseph Lancaster, he was chosen to be the master of the model school formed to illustrate the Lancasterian system, the usefulness of which he greatly increased, and the principles of which were carried out in the British schools. On the 30th, at Paris, aged 47, Carl Rosa, a well-known opera manager, who devoted himself to the production of operas in English. He was a violinist, and occasionally acted as a conductor.

MAY.

Count Dimitri Andreievitch Tolstoi, Minister of the Interior, died at St. Petersburg on the 7th, aged 65, from inflammation of the lungs, supervening upon other chronic ailments of long standing. He was born in 1823, and educated at the celebrated Lyceum of Tsarskoe Selo, where he took the gold medal. He at once passed into the Imperial service, and occupied various important posts in the Ministry of Marine and Ministry of the Interior in connection with the Department of Foreign Credits, and in 1849 was sent on a special mission into the provinces of Poland. His most important activity, previous to becoming Minister for Home Affairs in 1882, was exercised as Procurator of the Holy Synod and as Minister for Public Education, especially in the latter capacity, in which his institution of the new system of classical instruction rendered him most unpopular. He was also a voluminous author, but he was very remotely, if at all, related to his namesake, the eminent author and philosopher. In nearly all branches of State business in which Count Tolstoi had been concerned he published his theories and dogmatic views on the various subjects he had to deal with. He was a friend of Katkoff's, and his only son is married to a daughter of the famous Moscow editor.

He was a man with a strong personality, a firm and stoical character, somewhat of the professorial type, and a complete and ready programme of Statecraft, from which he never swerved, and which contrasted sharply with the weak and wavering policies, influenced by Nihilism and Liberal pressure, of his predecessors in office. He was relentlessly opposed to so-called Russian Liberalism, and disdainfully indifferent to public opinion. In politico-historical

literature, as well as current State affairs, he was a very hard worker, in spite of long-failing health, and up to the last he continued to labour in contending for his pet scheme of local reform or anti-reform in the government of the peasants.

He succeeded Count Ignatieff after the anti-Semitic riots, and when the disorder and rioting ceased under his firm direction, the prominent feature of his plans appeared to be the elevating, bettering, and employing of his own class, the nobility, in contradistinction to the partiality shown by previous Ministers for the peasants. His projected reform of the local administration was undertaken because the disorder and license prevailing among the peasants it was said rendered the rural districts almost uninhabitable for the landowners and nobility. Therefore, members of the latter class were to be employed in bringing the power of the central authorities to bear more directly upon the rural communes and peasant institutions. Count Tolstoi's programme was a national one, clearly-defined, without half measures, without compromise or concession; but, although regarded as a *docteur en la mort*, his character and views harmonised with those of his Imperial master.

Lord Sydney Godolphin Osborne—better known and very widely known to the readers of the *Times* for more than a generation as "S. G. O."—died on the 9th, at Lewes, at the mature age of 81. He was the third son of the first Lord Godolphin, and his eldest brother became eighth Duke of Leeds in succession to his cousin. He was educated at Rugby, graduated at Oxford in 1830, and, having taken Orders, he held for some years the rectory of Stoke Pogis,

near Eton. This preferment he exchanged, in 1841, for the rectory of Dureston, in Dorsetshire, to which he was appointed on the nomination of Lord Portman. In 1875 he resigned his living, and settled at Lewes, where he lived in solitary retirement until his death. For many years his facile and versatile pen was employed in illustrating, expounding, and enforcing many a fruitful lesson of social life, and in directing the attention of his countrymen to many of those problems which still perplex the wise and distress the benevolent. One of his first subjects was that of Ireland. He began to write on it more than forty years ago, and he had made himself master of it by direct and patient observation. He visited Ireland, intent on those benevolent purposes to which his whole life was devoted, first during the Famine period, and subsequently during the visitation of cholera. He published the results of his observations in a work entitled, "Gleanings from the West of Ireland" in 1850, and he was never more instructive and suggestive than when dealing with the social aspects of the Irish problem. A few years later, during the Crimean War, he undertook a philanthropic journey to the East, and published some of its results in his "Scutari and its Hospitals." For his labours on this self-appointed but most benevolent mission he received the thanks of the Government in acknowledgment of his disinterested endeavours for the relief of the sick and the comfort of the wounded. It was principally after this period that his letters, signed "S. G. O.," spread his name far and wide as an authority on social subjects. "Hints to the Charitable," and "Hints for the Amelioration of the Moral Condition of a Village," are titles of pamphlets published in 1856.

Lord S. G. Osborne, who had previously borne no title, was raised to the rank of a duke's son on the accession of his elder brother to the Dukedom of Leeds. He married, in 1834, Emily, daughter of Mr. Pascoe Grenfell, of Taplow Court, who died in 1878.

The Earl of Malmesbury (James Howard Harris) died on the 17th, at Heron Court, at the age of 82. The eldest son of the second earl, who had been a Lord of the Admiralty 1804-6, and Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs for a few months (1807) under Canning. He succeeded his father, the first Earl and eminent diplomatist, as Governor of the Isle of Wight. His eldest son,

James, was educated at Eton, and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he matriculated in 1825, and graduated three years later, and in the same year with Sir G. C. Lewis. In 1834 he made the acquaintance of Lord Derby, and it was their strong friendship that led to Lord Malmesbury's becoming prominent as a Minister. As Lord Fitz-Harris he was elected, in 1841, member for Wilton, in the Conservative interest. In the following year his father's death made him a peer. When Lord Derby became Premier, in 1852, Lord Malmesbury was made his Foreign Minister. Again, in 1858, the same post was conferred on him when Lord Derby became Premier a second time. With regard to this second Administration of Lord Derby, though the Opposition in the Commons had a majority, Lord Malmesbury always maintained that the Ministry would not have been beaten on the Address if Mr. Disraeli had previously laid on the table the Blue Book containing the Italian and French correspondence with the Foreign Office. Why this was not done he never knew, but twelve or fourteen members of the House of Commons voluntarily assured his lordship that, if they had read the correspondence before the debate, they would never have voted against the Government. Mr. Cobden was one of these. When Lord Derby became Prime Minister for the third time, in 1866, he again offered Lord Malmesbury the Foreign Office. In consequence of ill-health, however, he declined this post, and accepted that of Lord Privy Seal. This office he likewise subsequently held under Mr. Disraeli, in 1868 and 1874, until 1876, when he resigned on account of his increasing deafness. For some time he acted as leader of the Conservative party in the Upper House, being succeeded by Lord Cairns, Lord Salisbury having at that time declined the honour. In the session of 1869 Lord Malmesbury made a vigorous and successful effort to defeat the Life Peetrages Bill. Of recent years Lord Malmesbury's appearances in the House of Lords were very infrequent. Five years ago, a book which he published, under the title of "Memoirs of an ex-Minister," created great interest, forming, as it does, a sort of sequel of the diaries and letters of the previous Earl of Malmesbury. He married, in 1830, Lady Emma Bennet, a daughter of the fifth Earl of Tankerville, who died in 1876, and in 1890, Susan, a daughter of Mr. John Hamilton, of Fyne Court House, Somerset; but left no issue by either marriage.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 1st, in North Audley Street, aged 71, **William Wells**, of Holme Wood, Peterborough. Entered the army (1st Life Guards); married Lady Louisa Charteris, daughter of Francis, eighth Earl of Wemyss; represented Beverley, 1852-54, and Peterborough, 1868-74. A practical agriculturist, whose name is associated with the draining and reclaiming Whittlesea Mere. On the same date, at Teddesley, Staffordshire, aged 41, **Hon. William Francis Littleton, C.M.G.**, first son of second Lord Hatherton; educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford; called to the Bar, 1872; he had been private secretary at the Cape to Sir Bartle Frere, 1877-80; précis writer at the Mauritius, 1882-84, when he retired. On the 2nd, at Alnmouth, aged 72, **Lady Charlotte Augusta Granville**, sister of George Augustus, sixth Duke of Athole, K.T., and widow of the Rev. Court D'Ewes Granville, Canon of Durham, Incumbent of Alnwick, and Vicar of Chatton. On the 3rd, near Johannesburg, South Africa, **Lord Walter Campbell**, third son of eighth Duke of Argyll, one time Captain 12th Argyll Artillery Volunteers; a member of the London Stock Exchange. Married, 1874, **Olivia Rowlandson**, only daughter of J. Clarkson Milns, Esq., of Radcliffe Bridge, Lancashire. On the 4th, at Parndon Hall, Essex, aged 59, **Loftus Wigram Arkwright**, an ardent sportsman, who had been for a quarter of a century M.F.H. in Essex. He was the son of the Rev. Joseph Arkwright, of Mark Hall, and Vicar of Latton, and a great-grandson of the celebrated inventor. On the same date, at Bideford, aged 61, **Vice-Admiral Arthur Thomas Thrupp**. He entered the Royal Navy in 1843, and, as Lieutenant of the *Cruise*, served in the Baltic during the Russian War of 1854-55. While employed in China, as Lieutenant in the *Nimrod*, he was specially mentioned for services at the capture of the Peiho Forts, May 20, 1858. On the 5th, at Pau, **Francis Ormond**, a member of the Legislative Council of Victoria. He was one of the leading Victorian squatters, and in recent years his princely benefactions to the colony exceeded 250,000*l.* He founded and endowed the college in Melbourne which bears his name, and, besides being a most liberal patron of the Working Men's College in that city, he endowed the musical chair in connection with the University of Melbourne. On the 6th, in Dublin, aged 61, **Dr. Robert McDonnell**, an eminent Irish surgeon, who served in the Crimea on the Civil Staff. On the 7th, at Greenwich, aged 81, **J. B. Kidd**, the last surviving member of the original thirty-five founders of the Royal Scottish Academy. It was but quite recently that he was selected to paint a portrait of the Queen for the Royal Hospital Schools, Greenwich. He had been the guest of Sir Walter Scott, at Abbotsford. On the same date, at Carnwath House, Fulham, **Fanny Sullivan**, Countess of Carnwath, daughter of Mr. Henry Hppisley, of Lamborne Place, Berks, and married, in August, 1873, **Robert Harris Carnwath Dalzell**, who succeeded as twelfth Earl on the death of his uncle, November, 1867. On the same date, in Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, aged 59, **Henry Bret Ince, Q.C.**, of Cromwell Road, represented Hastings 1883-5, and East Islington 1885-6; called to the Bar in 1852. He had previously practised as a reporter, and earlier in life he had been employed in business connected with shipping. On the 8th, at Pencraig, county Anglesey, **Sir George Richard Waldie-Griffith**, second Baronet, of Munster Grillaigh, in the county of Londonderry. He was born January 31, 1820, the only son of Sir Richard John Griffith, a distinguished civil engineer, and author of the famous geological map of Ireland, who was created a Baronet for his long public services in 1858, by Maria Jane, his wife, eldest daughter and coheiress of Mr. George Waldie, of Hendersyde Park, in the county of Roxburgh. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1842. He was a D.L. and J.P. for Anglesey and Roxburghshire, and served as High Sheriff for the former county in 1860. In 1865 he assumed the additional surname of Waldie. He married, April 14, 1849, **Eliza**, youngest daughter of the late Mr. Nicholas Philpot Leader, M.P., of Dromagh Castle, in the county of Cork. On the 9th, at Codrington College, Barbados, the **Right Rev. Richard Rawle, D.D.**, late Bishop of Trinidad; formerly a Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was appointed Principal of the College in Barbados, where he remained seventeen years. On the Disestablishment of the Church in the West Indies, he was requested by the clergy of Trinidad to become their Bishop. Resigning this office at the end of sixteen years, he again became Principal of Codrington College, Barbados. On the 10th, at Grove Lodge, Winkfield, Berks, aged 66, the **Hon. Louisa Anne, Lady Vavasour**, wife of Sir H. Mervyn Vavasour, Bart., the second daughter of Richard Griffin, third Lord Braybrooke, and married to Sir H. M. Vavasour in June, 1853. On the 12th, at Nottingham, aged 85, **Major Jonathan White**, of the Robin Hood Rifles (Volunteers), who, enlisting in a Line regiment, served with distinction in the Afghan War of 1839. He

declined the offer of a commission, and became drill-instructor to the Nottingham Volunteer Corps, from which office he retired with the honorary rank of Major in 1879. On the 13th, at Spalding, Lincolnshire, aged 78, the Rev. Edward Moore, M.A., the vicar, and a Canon of Lincoln Cathedral, who was a well-known authority on Church architecture. On the 15th, at Weston-super-Mare, aged 73, the Rev. Thomas Saunders Evans, Senior Residentiary Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek in Durham University; a brilliant classical scholar, and an author. On the same date, in Hanover Terrace, Regent's Park, aged 63, Henry Pollock, lately a Master in the Supreme Court of Judicature. On the 16th, at Pembroke College, Oxford, Professor Henry William Chandler, Fellow and Tutor, and Waynflete Professor of Moral Philosophy; a laborious student, who was considered the most profound Aristotelian scholar in England. On the same date, at Megginch Castle, Perthshire, aged 86, John Murray Drummond, eldest son of Admiral Sir Adam Drummond, K.C.H. He was educated at Sandhurst, and entered the Grenadier Guards. Married, in 1835, Frances Jehima, fourth daughter of General Sir John Oswald, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., of Dunnikier, Fifehire. On the 17th, at Hohenschwangau, aged 63, Frederika Maria, the Queen Dowager of Bavaria, daughter of William, Prince of Prussia; married, 1842, Maximilian, Crown Prince, and afterwards King Maximilian II., who died in 1864. On the 18th, in Mount Street, aged 65, Mrs Dallas-Glyn, at one time a well-known actress, under the name of Miss Glyn, though her real name was Isabella Gearn. She was born at Edinburgh, and brought up in strict Presbyterian principles, but chance led her to take a leading part in an amateur performance at the St. James's Theatre in 1844. After studying at the Paris Conservatoire under M. Michelet, she returned to London, and appeared under Mr. Charles Kemble in several Shakespearian characters, and gained considerable success in the rôles of Portia, Hermione, and Lady Constance. More recently she gave readings in Shakespeare in England and the United States. In 1853 she married Mr. Dallas. On the 21st, at Folkestone, aged 62, Lieutenant-General the Hon. Edward T. Gage, C.B. He had served during the Crimean War as Brigade-Major of Artillery. On the 22nd, at Cambridge, aged 59, Dr. William Wright, a Fellow of Queen's College, and Professor of Arabic. An eminent Oriental scholar. On the same date, at Little Billing Rectory, Northampton, the Rev. Sir Thomas Collingwood Hughes, eighth Baronet, of East Bergholt Lodge, in the county of Suffolk. Born August 12, 1800, the eldest son of the Rev. Sir Robert Hughes, third Baronet (over forty-five years Rector of Frimley St. Mary, Suffolk), by Bertha, his second wife, daughter of Mr. Thomas Hiscutt, and succeeded to the title, on the death of his nephew, at the beginning of the present year. He was educated at Downing College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1829, and, entering Holy Orders in the latter year, became Curate of Wheatacre in 1845. He was Vicar of South Tawton from 1860 to 1872, and Rector of Little Billing, Northampton, from 1872 up to the time of his death. He married, first, May 31, 1820, Elizabeth St. John, daughter and coheir of Mr. Robert Butcher, of The Grange, near Bungay; and secondly, April 20, 1881, Mary Agnes Wenwood, daughter of Sir William Smith, third Baronet, of Eardiston. On the 23rd, at Heathercroft, Blackwater, Hants, John O'Connor, distinguished as a scene-painter, and as painter in both oil and water-colours of cabinet pictures. On the 24th, in Grosvenor Square, aged 87, Elizabeth, Lady Dashwood, the daughter of Mr. Theodore Henry Broadhead; married, in 1823, Sir George Henry Dashwood, the sixth Baronet, who died in 1862. On the same date, in South Kensington, aged 81, Alderman Sir Thomas Dakin, Knight, formerly Lord Mayor of the City of London. On the 25th, in Suffolk Street, aged 69, Martin Richard Sharpe, of Eastbourne, originally assistant editor at its establishment of the *Guardian* newspaper, and subsequently editor and manager. In 1883 he relinquished the editorship, but he continued till his death to discharge the duties of managing proprietor. On the same date, at Edinburgh, aged 31, George Philips Alexander Sinclair, fifteenth Earl of Caithness; educated at Magdalene College, Cambridge; Lord Lieutenant of County of Caithness. On the 26th, at Longford Hall, near Brailsford, Derbyshire, aged 65, the Hon. Edward Keppel Wentworth Coke, represented West Norfolk, 1847-52; second son of first Earl of Leicester. He was educated at Eton, and entered the Scotch Fusiliers; married, August 5, 1851, Hon. Diana Agar Ellis, daughter of first Lord Dover. On the same date, at Queen Anne's Gate, Lady Brabourne, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Marcus R. Southwell, of St. Albans; married, in 1852, to Edward Hugessen Knatchbull-Hugessen, first Baron Brabourne. On the 28th, at Surbiton, aged 98, the Ven. Benjamin Philpot. He graduated, in 1813, at Christchurch

College, Cambridge; in 1818 he was appointed Perpetual Curate of Walpole and Southwold, and became Vicar-General and Archdeacon of the Isle of Man in 1828. Eleven years after he became Rector of Great Cressingham, Norfolk; twenty years after that Vicar of Lydney, Forest of Dean; and Rector of Dennington, Suffolk, in 1871. On the 29th, at Tynningham Castle, N.B., Frances Henrietta Arden, wife of George, eleventh Earl of Haddington, and daughter of Sir John Warrender, fifth Baronet. Her mother, Lady Warrender, was daughter of the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Alvanley, and, in her right, her husband took by Royal license, in 1868, the additional surname of Arden.

JUNE.

Sir Charles Lanyon, Knt., an eminent engineer, died on the 1st, at White Abbey, near Belfast, in the county of Antrim, aged 76. He was son of Mr. John Jenkinson Lanyon, of Eastbourne, Sussex. He attained high eminence in his profession, became a member of the Institute of British Architects, and of the Institute of Civil Engineers. From 1862 to 1868 he was President of the Royal Institute of Architects in Ireland, and received in the latter year the honour of Knighthood. He filled also the office of High Sheriff of the county of Antrim, 1875-6; was M.P. for Belfast, 1866-8. He married, in 1837, Elizabeth Helen, daughter of Mr. Jacob Owen, architect to the Board of Works in Ireland.

Sir William Wedderburn Arbuthnot, Bart., died suddenly, at 54, South Eaton Place, on the 5th, aged 57. He was eldest son of Sir Robert Keith Arbuthnot, second Baronet, by Anne, his wife, younger daughter of Field-Marshal Sir John Forster Fitzgerald, G.C.B., and grandson of Sir W. Arbuthnot, who was made a Baronet at the civic banquet given to King George IV., at Edinburgh, in 1822, at which Mr. Arbuthnot presided as Lord Provost. He married, June 11, 1863, Alice Margaret, daughter of the Rev. Matthew Carrier Tompson, Vicar of Alderminster, Worcestershire.

Major E. A. De Cosson, F.R.G.S., died at Southfield House, Frome, Somerset, on the 5th, aged 89. He was descended from an ancient French family established in the South of France until the Revolution, when his grandfather emigrated, serving first in the army of the Princes, and then in the Hompesche Regiment of Hussars, which, becoming the 10th Hussars in the British Army, he came with it to England. In 1878 Major De Cosson visited King John of Abyssinia, then encamped near Lake Tsana, at the head of the Blue Nile. Thence he proceeded to

Khartoum, and rode across the desert to Suakin. He published an account of this journey in a book entitled "The Cradle of the Blue Nile." In 1885 he was attached to Sir Gerald Graham's Field Force at Suakin, in command of the Water Transport. He was present at the battle of Tofrek (M'Neill's zereba), where his horse was shot under him. He was mentioned in despatches, and gazetted Major on his return from the Egyptian campaign, of which he gave an account in a work entitled "Days and Nights of Service." He married, on March 11, 1879, at Weymouth, Eliza, daughter of George Morant, Esq., late of the Grenadier Guards.

Lord Adelbert Percy Cecil, third son of Brownlow, second Marquess of Exeter, was born in 1841, and entered the army, serving for some time in the Rifle Brigade. After some years military service he threw himself into the cause of Evangelisation, and laboured devotedly in the cause both in England and the Colonies. Drowned on the 12th, near Adolphustown, Lennox, Western Canada, while out alone in a small boat. He was crossing the Bay of Quinte, Lake of Ontario, and, standing up to adjust the sail, lost his balance, and fell headlong into the water.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. William Edward Fitz-Maurice, late 2nd Life Guards, died on the 18th, at Brussels. He was born March 21, 1805, the second son of John, Viscount Kirkwall, by Anna Maria, his wife, eldest daughter of John, first Lord de Blaquiere, and was brother of Thomas, fifth and late Earl of Orkney. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, and entered the 2nd Life Guards, from which he retired as Honorary Lieutenant-Colonel. He afterwards became Captain of the South Middlesex Rifle Volunteers, and subsequently Major of the Denbighshire Yeomanry Cavalry. He represented Bucks in Parliament as a Conservative

from 1842 to 1847. He married, first, August 3, 1837, Hester, daughter of Mr. Henry Harford, of Down Place, Berkshire, which lady died August 24, 1859; and secondly, October 3, 1870, Anne Louisa, eldest daughter of Mr. John Hutton, of Deal, Kent.

Lord Francis Horace Pierrepont Cecil, who died on the 23rd at his residence, Stocken Hall, near Oakham, was born July 5, 1851, the second son of William Alleyne Cecil, third Marquess of Exeter, by Lady Georgina Pakenham, his wife, second daughter of Thomas, first Earl of Longford. He was educated at Eton, and in 1865 entered the Royal Navy, from which he retired as Lieutenant in 1884; becoming J.P. for the counties of Lincoln and Rutland, and serving as High Sheriff for the latter county in 1881. He married, October 14, 1874, Edith, daughter of Sir William Cunliffe Brooks, first Baronet, M.P. for East Cheshire.

Walter Rice Howell Powell, of Maesgwynne, Carmarthenshire, M.P. for the Western Division of that county, died on the 26th. He was born April 4, 1819, the eldest son of the late Mr. Walter Rice Howell Powell, of Maesgwynne, by Mary, his wife, daughter of the late Mr. Joshua Powell, of Brislington, and was educated at Christchurch, Oxford. He served the office of High Sheriff for Carmarthenshire in 1849; and was, for more than half a century, Master of the Foxhounds. He represented the county in Parliament as an advanced Liberal from April, 1880, to November, 1885, and the Western Division from December, 1885. He married, first, in 1840, Emily Anne, second daughter of the late Mr. Henry Skrine, of Warleigh Manor, Somerset, and of Stabbings, Berks; and secondly, in 1851, Catharine Anne Prudence, second daughter of Mr. Grismond Philipps, of Cwmgwilly, Carmarthen.

Goodwin Charles Colquitt-Goodwin-Craven, of Brockhampton Park, co. Gloucester, died on the 29th, at his seat near Andoversford, aged 73. He was the eldest son of the late Colonel Goodwin Colquitt, C.B., of the Grenadier Guards, by Anne Colquhoun, his wife, youngest daughter of the late Mr. John Wallace, of Kelly, in the county of Renfrew. He was educated at Eton, and served for some years in the 5th Dragoon Guards,

and was High Sheriff for Gloucestershire in 1864. He married, June 17, 1841, Georgina Maria, only daughter and heiress of Mr. Fulwar Craven, of Brockhampton Park, who died April 10, 1878. Mr. Colquitt assumed, by Royal license, in 1842, the surname and arms of Goodwin on succeeding to the estates of Mr. Charles Goodwin, of Farndon, in the county of Chester; and, again, in 1861, by another Royal license, adopted the name and arms of Craven, on succeeding to his father-in-law's property.

Miss Maria Mitchell, LL.D., who died at New York about the 29th, was the daughter of William Mitchell, astronomer, and was born in Nantucket, Massachusetts, August 1, 1818. She developed such remarkable talents that early in life she was able to assist her father in his mathematical and astronomical investigations. At eighteen she was appointed librarian of the Nantucket Athenæum. From this time she made careful original observations, and devoted considerable time to the examination of nebulae and the search for comets. In 1847 she made the important discovery of a comet, for which she received a gold medal from the King of Denmark and other distinctions. She went to Europe in 1858, and visited the principal observatories of Great Britain and the Continent. Miss Mitchell was the guest of Sir John Herschel and Sir George B. Airy during her stay in England, and also visited Leverrier in Paris and Humboldt in Berlin. In 1865 she was called to the Professorship of Astronomy at Vassar College, which, with the post of director of the observatory, she retained until January, 1888, when she secured a long leave of absence. In addition to her teaching, she devoted much labour to the study of the sun spots and the satellites of Jupiter and Saturn, contributing numerous articles to scientific journals. The degree of LL.D. was conferred upon her by Hanover College in 1852 and by Columbia College in 1887. She was a member of various scientific societies, and was the first woman to be elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She took a prominent part in the movement to elevate woman's work, having held the presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Women at the Syracuse meeting in 1875, and at the Philadelphia meeting in 1876.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 6th, at Belaggio, Lake of Como, aged 75, Edward Henshaw Cheney, of Gaddesby Hall, Leicestershire, a notable breeder of shorthorn cattle. On the 7th, aged 91, Major-General Sir Thomas Hurdle, K.C.B. He commanded the Brigade of the Royal Marines in

the Crimean War, and was Aide-de-Camp to the Queen. On the 10th, at Moor Park, Farnham, aged 79, John Frederick La Trobe Bateman, F.R.S., a civil engineer of great repute. On the 12th, at Pekin, aged 50, His Excellency Shioda Saburo, Minister of Japan at the Court of China, who first came into prominence under the Government of the Shôgun, overthrown in 1868. On the 13th, aged 69, the Maharajah of Benares, chief of the Brahman community in that city. On the 14th, at Edinburgh, aged 79, Sir James Falshaw, first baronet, some time Lord Provost of Edinburgh, distinguished as a railway engineer. On the 16th, at The Circus, Bath, aged 92, Lieutenant-Colonel Barton Parker-Browne, of Canonsleigh Abbey, Devon, formerly of the 11th Hussars, a Waterloo officer who had served in the whole campaign of 1815. On the 19th, in Gloucester Crescent, Hyde Park, aged 72, John Percy, M.D., F.R.S., who for more than a quarter of a century practically directed all the metallurgical teaching in this country. Formerly a practising physician in Birmingham, where he carried on some remarkable experiments, he abandoned his profession on being appointed Lecturer on Metallurgy to the Government School of Mines, and devoted himself to scientific research. Up to the time of his death he superintended the ventilation of the Houses of Parliament. On the same date, at Longueville House, Mallow, aged 87, Richard Longfield, formerly M.P. for the county of Cork. On the 20th, at Hampstead, aged 85, Frederick Tayler, a well-known artist, for many years President of the Old Water-colour Society. On the 26th, in Jersey, aged 59, Major-General Francis Hastings McLeod, of the Royal (Bengal) Artillery, who had served throughout the Indian Mutiny Campaign. On the 27th, at College Green, Gloucester, aged 91, the Rev. Richard Harvey, Canon Residentiary of the Cathedral, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen; for many years Rector of Hornsey. On the same date, aged 54, Sir James Davidson Gordon, K.C.S.I., late Judicial Commissioner and Resident at Mysore, and private secretary to Lord Lawrence when Viceroy of India. On the 28th, at Paris, aged 48, Madame Carlotta Patti, a talented vocalist, the wife of the violinist Ernst de Munk, and the sister of Madame Adelina Patti. On the 29th, at St. Petersburg, aged 74, John Hughes, the originator and managing director of the New Russian Company's immense iron and steel works and rolling mills at Ekaterinoslav; previously for many years a director of the Millwall Iron and Ship-building Works. On the 30th, aged 80, Richard Machell Jaques, of Easby Abbey, Richmond, Yorkshire, who formerly possessed one of the largest racing studs in the north of England, and a well-known breeder of cattle. He never won any of the great races, although he bred many horses which distinguished themselves in other stables. His horse Mildew was defeated in the Derby of 1850 by Lord Zetland's Voltigeur, and his colt High Treason for the St Leger of 1860 by St. Albans. His stud comprised Irish Birdcatcher, Pyrrhus the First, Weatherbit, &c., and he sold the famous Saunterer as a foal for 50 guineas.

JULY.

Colonel William Hay Macnaghten, C.B., Commandant 15th (Duke of Cornwall's) Bengal Lancers, died at Gotherstone, Bedford, on the 1st, at the age of 47. He was a son of the late Mr Elliott Macnaghten, a member of the Indian Council, of Ovingdean, by his first wife, Isabella, only daughter of the late Mr. John Law, and was born in March, 1842. He entered the Indian Army in June, 1858, and was gazetted to the 8th Bengal Cavalry in the following August, when he received his lieutenant's commission. Gazetted a captain in July, 1864, and brevet-major in December, 1874, he served in the Afghan war from 1878 till 1880, taking part with the first expedition into the Hazar Valley, being mentioned in despatches. In the advance on Cabul

he was twice mentioned in despatches and received the medal for his services. Receiving the brevet of lieutenant-colonel in January, 1881, he served with the 13th Bengal Cavalry in the Egyptian war of 1882, being mentioned in despatches, and obtaining the Companionship of the Bath (November, 1882), the Egyptian medal, the 30th Class of the Osmanieh, and the Khedive's star. In January, 1885, he obtained his colonel's commission in the Bengal Cavalry, and in September, 1886, was appointed a Brigadier-General in Bengal. Colonel Macnaghten married, in 1869, Alice Ellen, daughter of Colonel Mangles J. Brander.

Major Alexander George Dickson, M.P. for Dover, died at his town resi-

dence, No. 3 Stratford Place, on the 4th. He was born in 1834, and educated at Rugby. Entering the Army in 1853, he became, after previous service, Captain in the Carabineers (6th Dragoon Guards) and Major in the 13th Hussars. He was in the Crimean campaign—at the attack on the Quarries and the Redan, for which he received a medal and clasp. In 1857 he was present at Meerut, and was at the siege of Delhi, for which he had also medal and clasp. He sat in Parliament, on moderate Conservative principles, for twenty-four years, having been first elected for Dover in 1865. Major Dickson married, July 10, 1861, Charlotte Maria, Lady North, widow of Dudley, Lord North, and third daughter of Hon. and Rev. William Eden, Rector of Hishopsbourne.

Lord Ashburton.—Alexander Hugh Baring, fourth Baron Ashburton, who died at Bath House, Piccadilly, on the 12th, was the only son of Francis Baring, third baron, by his wife, who was the daughter of the Duc de Bassano, Minister of Napoleon I. He was educated at Harrow, and at Christchurch, Oxford, where he graduated in 1857, and in the same year was elected as member for Thetford, and sat as a Liberal Conservative for that borough until 1867. In 1864 he married Hon. Leonora C. Digby, fourth daughter of the ninth Lord Digby.

Sir Francis Ottiwell Adams, K.C.M.G., C.B., son of Commissary-General J. H. Adams, was born in 1825, and graduated in 1848, at Trinity College, in both classical and mathematical honours. In 1852 he was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn, and entered the diplomatic service as Attaché at Stockholm in 1854, and was afterwards appointed to St. Petersburg, 1856-59, when he was transferred to Paris, after which he was sent to Washington, 1864-66, but returned to Paris and remained there until he was sent as Secretary of Legation at Jeddah, where for some time he was Chargé d'Affaires. In 1872 he was promoted to be Secretary of Embassy at Berlin, and in 1874 was transferred to Paris, where he was accredited as Minister Plenipotentiary in the absence of the Ambassador, and

acted as such on various occasions until 1881, when he was appointed Envoy and Minister at Berne, and resided there until his retirement in 1888. He was first British Delegate to the Postal Congress, held at Paris, 1878, and to the International Copyright Conference at Berne, 1884-86. He was made C.B. in 1878 and K.C.M.G. in 1886. In the following year he published, in connection with Mr. C. D. Cunningham, a work on the Swiss Confederation, treated historically and politically. He died at Grindelwald on the 25th, after a short illness.

Sir George Russell Clerk, K.C.B., G.C.S.I., whose death occurred on the 25th at his residence, 83 Elm Park Gardens, S.W., was the eldest son of Mr. John Clerk, of Worting House, Hampshire, by the daughter and co-heir of Mr. Carew Mildmay, of Shawford House, in the same county. He was born at Worting House in 1800, and educated at Haileybury College, and he entered the service of the East India Company in 1818. In 1830 he was made Political Agent on the Bengal frontier, and he became in succession British Envoy at Lahore, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, and Governor of Bombay. This last office he resigned in 1847. Returning to England he was created a K.C.B. in 1848, and was offered the Governorship of the Cape of Good Hope, which he declined, though he undertook the duties of a Commissioner for settling the boundary question then in dispute in the colony. In 1856 he was nominated Permanent Under-Secretary to the Indian Board, on the reconstruction of our Indian Administration, and in 1858 he became Under-Secretary of State for India. In April, 1860, he was again nominated to the Governorship of Bombay, but he resigned in consequence of ill-health in 1861, and was appointed a member of her Majesty's Indian Council in December, 1863. He held the latter appointment until 1876. On the establishment of the Order of the Star of India in 1861 he was one of the first created Knights of the Order, and on its extension in 1866 he was nominated a Knight Grand Cross. Sir George Clerk married, in 1832, the widow of Colonel Stewart.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 5th, at Winnipeg, aged 48, the Hon. John Norquay, a distinguished Canadian statesman, ex-Premier of Manitoba, where he had been a member of the Legislative Assembly from its first constitution. On the 7th, at Hyderabad, aged 25, Sir Salar Jung,

K.C.I.E., the son of the late famous Minister of the Nizam, and had for a short time filled his father's post. On the same date, at Symond's Hotel, aged 69, the **Hon. and Rev. John Townshend Boscawen**, Rector of Lamorran, Cornwall, second son of the Hon. and Rev. John Evelyn Boscawen, Canon of Canterbury. His elder brother became sixth Viscount Falmouth. He married, in 1851, Mary, daughter of Mr. John Hearle Tremayne, of Helgan, co. Cornwall. He was one of the most eminent botanists of his time, and established a great reputation for landscape gardening. On the 10th, at Cheltenham, **Deputy-Surgeon-General Francis Day, F.R.S., LL.D., C.I.E.**, a great naturalist who had devoted much time and labour to the study of the fishes of India. On the 12th, at Bournemouth, aged 87, the Dowager Countess of Pomfret, daughter of Sir Richard Borough, of Basildon, sixth baronet. She married, first, in 1823, Thomas William, fourth Earl, who died in 1833, whose title became extinct on the death of his son in 1867; secondly, in 1834, the Rev. William Thorpe, D.D., who died in 1865. On the same date, at Oakley Park, Ludlow, aged 59, **Lady Mary Windsor Clive**, fifth daughter of George, second Earl of Bradford. Married, in 1852, Hon. Robert Windsor Clive, eldest son of Harriet, Baroness Windsor, by the Hon. Robert Henry Clive, who died in 1855. On the 15th, aged 83, **Sir James Allanson Picton, Knight**, of Sandynowe, Wavertree, near Liverpool, an architect by profession. He gave much time to literary and antiquarian pursuits, and was prominently identified with the local affairs of Liverpool for upwards of half a century. On the 17th, at Shortlands, near Bromley, Kent, aged 16½ years and 11 months, **Mrs. Catherine Voss**, whose maiden name was Warburton. She preserved hearing, sight, and memory to the last. On the 26th, in Beaufort Gardens, S.W., aged 61, **Lieutenant-General Charles Frederick Torrens Daniell, C.B.**, who had served in the Crimean campaign. On the 27th, in Eaton Place, aged 80, **Admiral Sir Robert Spencer Robinson, K.C.B., F.R.S.**, Controller of the Navy, 1861-71, and a Lord of the Admiralty 1868-71. Was the youngest son of the Ven. Sir John Robinson, Archdeacon of Armagh, by Mary Anne, daughter of Mr. Jas. Spencer. He was born at Welford Park, Berks, in January, 1809, and entered the Royal Navy as a cadet in 1822, rising to the rank of Captain in 1840, when he was placed on half-pay. In 1860 he became Rear-Admiral, and remained on the active list until 1870. He married, in 1841, Clementina, daughter of Sir John Louis. On the 30th, in Warwick Square, aged 76, **Robert Wigram Crawford**, son of Wm. Crawford, who sat for the City of London 1833-41, by Dorothy, daughter of Captain James Rice. Married, 1869, Margaret Urquhart, daughter of Rev John Cruickshank. He was head of the firm of Crawford, Colvin and Co., Chairman of the East Indian Railway, and a Governor of the Bank of England. Represented Harwich for two months, 1851, and the City of London as a Liberal, 1857-74. On the 31st, at Kelso, aged 78, **Admiral the Hon. Thomas Baillie**, of Dryburgh Abbey, youngest son of George Baillie, of Jarviswoode, Lanarkshire. Entered Royal Navy in 1827, and was present at the battle of Navarino, and commanded the White Sea Squadron of the British Fleet during the Crimean War, 1855; became Rear-Admiral, 1863, and shortly afterwards was placed on the retired list. He was raised in 1859 to the rank of an earl's son, on his brother becoming tenth Earl of Haddington.

AUGUST.

Signor Benedetto Cairoli was born at Gropello, near Pavia, on January 28, 1826. His father, Charles Cairoli, was a surgeon of some repute who fought in the campaign against Austria in 1848 and died soon after the battle of Novara. Several of Charles Cairoli's sons met their death in the struggle for Italian independence. Benedetto Cairoli at twenty-two years of age, and while yet a student in the University of Zürich, also joined the rising against the

Austrian domination, and conspired and fought as a volunteer in 1848. In 1851 he became an exile and resided at Piedmont until 1859, when, at the time of the French expedition, he again took up arms for the liberation of Italy as one of the "Cacciatori delle Alpi." He continued the struggle after the peace of Villafranca, and was one of "the thousand" who made a descent into Sicily in 1860 and attempted to wrest that province from the government of

the Bourbons. During this expedition he distinguished himself, as did also one of his brothers, Henri Cairoli, at the fight of Calatufimi, and shortly afterwards he was severely wounded in the leg at the siege of Palermo. In spite of his wound, from which he did not recover until two years later after a painful operation, Signor Cairoli assisted at the Convocation at Naples of the first Italian Parliament on February 18, 1861. He had been elected deputy for Brivio, in the province of Como. From this time Signor Cairoli never left the political arena, taking his full share in the hard fighting that a political career at the time involved. He fought in the Trentino in 1866, and in the following year at Monterotondo and at Garibaldi's disastrous defeat at Mentana. Up to the time of the advent of the Left to power in 1876 Cairoli had never explicitly declared himself to have left his old Republican tendencies behind him and definitely accepted the Constitutional Monarchy of Italy. From that time, however, led by Signor Depretis, he accepted the Monarchy, although he professed strongly advanced views in matters of both Church and State.

Soon after the accession of King Humbert, Signor Cairoli, on March 8, 1878, the morrow of the opening of the Session, was elected President of the Chamber of Deputies. A few days later, the Depretis Cabinet having resigned, he was called upon to form a Ministry, being appointed President of the Council without portfolio. He composed his Ministry mostly of new men, with Count Corti as Foreign Minister. This Cabinet was shortlived, all its members resigning on October 28, and Signor Cairoli, as Premier, was again entrusted with the task of reconstituting the Cabinet. Soon afterwards an event brought Signor Cairoli prominently before the eyes of Europe and insured him a great tribute of sympathy. On November 17, 1878, King Humbert, accompanied by the Queen and the Prime Minister, was diving into Naples, when a man named Giovanni Passanante sprang at the carriage and attempted to stab his Majesty with a dagger. Signor Cairoli seized the assassin's hand in time and fortunately frustrated the attempt, but was himself severely wounded, while the King escaped with no more hurt than a slight scratch. For this action, apart from the warm gratitude of the King, Signor Cairoli received from the Chambers and from the whole Italian people the warmest thanks and congratulations, in which the Sovereigns

and the most distinguished statesmen of Europe joined. But all these ovations were powerless to avert or even stay a fresh Ministerial crisis, and against the coalition of parties, excited not against himself but against his colleagues whom he refused to sacrifice, the Premier was unable to make headway. In the Chamber of Deputies, on December 11, 1878, a motion of confidence in the internal policy of the Government was rejected by 257 against 183 votes, and the Ministers thereupon resigned. The Depretis Ministry, which was formed on the resignation of the Cairoli Cabinet, was in turn overthrown after six months' tenure of power, and was succeeded by a new combination of the Left, again under Signor Cairoli, who had made no change in his programme, but was compelled in November, 1879, to reconstruct his Administration and to bring in Signor Depretis as Minister of the Interior. On May 14, 1881, this Ministry resigned after the French expedition to Tunis, as their policy in regard to it had rendered them highly unpopular.

Signor Cairoli, whose health had for some time been indifferent, took this opportunity of withdrawing from active and political life. The King in recognition of his services placed the royal villa of Capo di Monte, near Naples, at his disposal, and he died there on the 8th, to the great regret of all classes and parties. At the King's desire a public funeral was given to Signor Cairoli's remains, and the magnificent ceremony bore witness to the widespread esteem which this statesman had inspired.

The Earl of Granard, who died at his Irish seat, Castle Forbes, co. Longford, on the 25th was the eldest son of George, Viscount Forbes, and was born August 5, 1833, succeeding to his grandfather's title in 1887. He was educated at Eton, and was attaché at Dresden, 1851-54, when he resigned and became captain in the Westmeath Militia. He was a magistrate for several counties, a Knight of Malta, Knight Grand Cross of St. Gregory the Great, hon. colonel of the 9th Battalion Rifle Brigade (Prince Consort's Own), Vice-Administrator of the Province of Connaught, and a Senator of the Royal University of Ireland. In 1856 he was made Lord Lieutenant of Leitrim, but resigned the post in 1872, and was made a Knight of St. Patrick, 1857. He married, first, 1858, Jane Colclough, daughter of Hamilton K. Grogan-Morgan, of Johnstown Castle, co.

Wexford, and second, 1873, Hon. Frances M. Petre, daughter of twelfth Baron Petre.

John Gellibrand Hubbard was the eldest son of the late Mr. John Hubbard, and was born in 1805. He devoted himself to commercial pursuits, and became the head of the firm of Hubbard and Co., of St. Helen's Place, well known as Russia merchants in London. He was also a director and past governor of the Bank of England, was from 1853 to 1875 Chairman of the Public Works Exchequer Loan Commission, and was an eminent City magnate for many years. Mr. Hubbard married in 1837 the Hon. Maria Margaret, eldest daughter of the eighth Baron Napier. In May, 1859, Mr. Hubbard, who was then a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Buckinghamshire, entered Parliament, and sat for the borough of Buckingham, which he represented in the Conservative interest from that year until 1868, when the Reform Act deprived Buckingham of one of its members, and he was defeated by his former colleague, Sir H. Verney. At the general election of 1874 he was elected one of the members for the City of London, and his name was added to the Privy Council, which he continued to represent until his elevation to the peerage in 1887. At the House of Commons during his long career as a member Mr. Hubbard was a frequent attendant, and though he did not speak often he was well listened to on commercial and financial subjects, and notably upon the subject of the income-tax. In 1861 he

carried in the House of Commons a motion against the Government for a Committee to inquire into the working of the income-tax, and he strenuously advocated in Parliament a modification of the most unpopular features of that impost. He wrote many able pamphlets on monetary questions, notably among them being "A Vindication of a Fixed Duty on Corn," published in 1842; "The Currency of the Country," in 1843; "How should the Income-tax be levied?" and "Reform or Repeat the Income-tax," in 1853, besides other pamphlets on commercial and financial policy. A High Churchman and a member of the House of Laymen, he took a prominent part both in and out of Parliament as a defender of the Established Church, and he always insisted upon the maintenance of religious instruction as a basis of all education. Throughout the coinage controversy carried on in 1869 in the columns of the *Times*, Mr. Hubbard conducted a resolute and successful resistance to the debasement of the standard of value or reduction in the intrinsic worth of the gold coin, which had been proposed with the object of equalising the English sovereign and a French twenty-five franc gold piece as international gold coins. In 1887 he was raised to the peerage by Lord Salisbury's Government and was created Baron Addington, but his advancing years prevented him from taking an active part in the business of the House of Lords. He died on the 28th, at Addington Manor, Windsor, Bucks, at the ripe age of 84 years.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 1st, in London, aged 71, Sir William Ewart, Bart., M.P., son of Alderman Ewart, co. Down. Married, 1846, Isabella, daughter of Lavens Mathewson, of Newtownstewart, co. Tyrone. Represented the North of Ireland Linen Manufactures in the negotiations of the French Treaty of 1864. First elected for Belfast in 1868 as a Conservative. Created a baronet on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee. On the 3rd, at St. Gratien, aged 78, Felix Pyat, a well-known Communist and Revolutionist. On the same date, at Yaldhurst, Lymington, aged 59, George Phillips Bevan, F.G.S., &c., the author of several popular guide-books and hand-books. On the 5th, at Dresden, Fanny Lewald, a celebrated German novelist, and wife of the German author Adolf Stahr. On the same date, aged 76, the Rev. John Ferdinando Collins, of Betterton House, Berkshire, an estate which had descended from father to son since the time of Henry VI. He was educated at Winchester and University College, Oxford. Married Sarah, daughter of John Hawthorn, of Glencuce, co. Wigton. On the 7th, aged 60, William Ralston Sheddon Ralston, who was the author of many well-known works, some of which were connected with Russian folk-lore. He was for some years an assistant librarian in the British Museum. On the 9th, at Margate, aged 60, Sir James Marshall, K.C.M.G., son of Rev. James Marshall, Vicar of Christ Church, Clifton. Educated at Exeter College, Oxford, and for some time classical master in the Birmingham Oratory School. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1868, and was appointed in 1873 Chief Magistrate and Judicial Assessor to the native chiefs on the Gold Coast; led the Cape Coast chiefs and levies in the Ashanti war; served as a Judge in Cape Colony.

1876-79, and Chief Justice (1879-82) of the colony and of the territories of the Royal Niger Company. Married, 1877, Alice, daughter of C. Gwyllyn Young, of Corby, Lincolnshire. On the 18th, at Mussoorie, William Watts M'Nair, of the Indian Survey Department, who in 1833 had made, disguised as a Mahomedan physician, an adventurous journey into the Hindoo Koosh, obtaining thereby much valuable information. On the 15th, at Bordeaux, aged 77, Monsignor A. V. François Guilbert, Archbishop of Bordeaux. On the 17th, at Vienna, aged 42, Ernst Frank, a distinguished German musician, for many years Court Capellmeister at Hanover. On the 19th, aged 56, Comte Auguste Villiers de Lisle-Adam, a French poet, dramatist, and novelist. On the 20th, at Green's Norton Rectory, Towcester, aged 63, the Rev. Samuel Beal, D.C.L., rector of the parish, and Professor of Chinese at the London University. Was a distinguished Oriental scholar, and author of many works on Buddhist subjects. On the 22nd, in Brook Street, aged 64, Samuel Osborne Habershon, M.D., F.R.C.F., a distinguished physician who was the author of numerous medical works. He was senior physician at Guy's Hospital until his resignation in 1880. On the same date, at Pawlowsk, near St. Petersburg, aged 79, André Alexandrowitsch Kraiefsky, the founder, proprietor, and chief director of the now defunct *Golos*. He had been connected with numerous other Russian papers, and has been called the originator of the great political press of his country. On the 23rd, at Watford, Robert Pryor, of High Elms, Herts, younger son of Thomas Marlborough Pryor, of Hampstead. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn, 1837, J.P. and D.L. for Herts; High Sheriff, 1868. Married, 1844, Eliza Caroline, daughter of Wyrley Birch, of Wretham. On the 25th, at Carlton House Terrace, aged 77, Colonel George Tomline, of Orwell Park, Suffolk, son of William E. Tomline, M.P., by Frances, daughter of John Amley, of Ford Hall, Salop, and grandson of Bishop Pretymann, of Winchester, Pitt's tutor, who in 1803 assumed the name of Tomline under the will of Marmaduke Tomline, of Rily Grove, Lincoln. George Tomline was educated at Eton; entered the Militia, and became Colonel of Lincoln Militia. Sat as a Conservative in Parliament for Sudbury, 1840-41; Shrewsbury, 1841-47, and 1852-68; and Great Grimsby, 1861-74. On the same date, at Johannesburg, South Africa, aged 51, Charles Henry Anderson, Q.C., M.P. for Elgin and Nairn, 1886. He was the son of the Rev. Richard Anderson, of Aiskew House, Bedale, Yorkshire. Called to the Bar, Inner Temple, 1867; Q.C., 1885. Married, 1880, Ada, daughter of Edmund Pontifex. On the 26th, at Fort Stewart, co. Donegal, aged 57, Sir Augustus A. J. Stewart, ninth baronet, J.P. and D.L., eldest son of Captain Wm. Augustus Stewart, 68th Regiment. Succeeded to the baronetcy of his kinsman, Sir James Annesley, 1879. On the 31st, aged 79, Edward Fenwick Boyd, son of William Boyd, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, a partner in the banking firm of Sir M. Ridley and Co. He was one of the founders of the North of England Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineering, and for fifty years the mineral agent of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, and of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

SEPTEMBER.

The Bishop of Oxford, Right Rev. John Fielder Mackarness, who died after a long and lingering illness at Angus House, Eastbourne, on the 16th, was the youngest son of John Mackarness, a West India merchant in London. He was educated at Eton and afterwards at Merton College, where he obtained a postmastership, and was subsequently elected to a Fellowship at Exeter College. In 1845 he was presented by the Clive family to the living of Pardebigge, Worcestershire, which he exchanged in 1855 for the rectory of Honiton, which carried with it the headmastership of the Honiton Grammar School. In 1845 he married Alethea Buchanan, youngest daughter of Right. Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge and sister of Lord Coleridge. In

1858 he was promoted by the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Phillpotts) to an hon. prebendal stall in Exeter Cathedral, and ten years later he obtained the small vicarage of Monkton, near Honiton. He was also for some time chaplain to Lord Lyttelton. From 1865 to 1869 Dr. Mackarness was one of the Proctors in Convocation for the clergy of the diocese of Exeter. In the latter year he failed to secure his seat on account of his approval of Mr. Gladstone's measure for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, but he was promptly consoled by the offer of the bishopric of Oxford, which became vacant in the same year by the translation of Dr. Wilberforce to the see of Winchester. Dr. Mackarness held the bishopric for

nineteen years, and was at length, in 1888, on account of failing health, obliged to take advantage of the Bishops' Resignation Act, and retired altogether from active life.

Lofius Tottenham Wigram, Q.C., was at his death the surviving son of the twenty-three children of Sir Robert Wigram, first baronet, an eminent merchant, who successively represented Fowey and co. Wicklow. His son, Lofius Tottenham, born in 1803, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as eighth wrangler in 1825. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1828, and was made Q.C. in 1842, and was a Bencher 1842-84. In 1849 he married Lady Katherine Jane Douglas, daughter of fifth Earl of Selkirk, and sat for Cambridge University, 1850-59, as a Conservative. For many years he had refused to leave London at any period of the year, but was at length persuaded by his friends to try a change. He caught cold, and after a short illness died on the 19th, at Marsh Hall, Essex, having nearly completed his 85th year.

Brodie of Brodie—Hugh Fife-Ashley Brodie of Brodie, who died at Glion, Montreux, Switzerland, on the 28th, aged 49, was son and successor of William Brodie of Brodie, Lord Lieutenant of Nairnshire, by Elizabeth, daughter of Colonel Hugh Baillie, M.P., of Redcastle. He married in 1868 Lady Eleanor Moreton, third daughter of the second Earl of Duncu, and succeeded his father as Lord-Lieutenant of his county. His great-grandfather, James Brodie, of Brodie, married Lady Margaret Duff, daughter of the first Earl of Fife, who was burnt to death at Brodie Castle in 1786. Their eldest son, James Brodie, was drowned a few years afterwards.

Lady Holland.—Lady Augusta Mary, widow of the last Lord Holland, and daughter of George William, sixth Earl of Coventry, was born in 1812, and in 1833 was married to Hon Henry Edward Fox, who for a few years (1839-42) was Minister-Plenipotentiary at the Court of Tuscany. Soon after he returned to London, and on succeeding to the title as fourth Baron Holland, he and Lady Holland continued the literary and political gatherings of which Holland House had been the scene—especially in the days of the third lord—for many years. The traditions and historical associations of Holland House were made the subject of a book written by the adopted

daughter of Lord and Lady Holland, who became Princess Liechtenstein, but died within a short time of her marriage. Lady Holland resided a great portion of the year at Naples, and when in England divided her time between Holland House, Kensington, and St. Ann's Hill, Chertsey. Her death, which took place on the 21st, at the last-named place, was very sudden and unexpected, although she was apparently more aware of her danger than her friends, for it was with difficulty that one of the monks of the neighbouring Carmelite House could be fetched in time to administer the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church.

William Wilkie Collins, the eldest son of William Collins, R.A., the celebrated landscape painter, was born in 1824. His grandfather, William Collins the elder, was by profession a picture dealer, but was also the author of a rather dull poem on the Slave Trade, and of a curious rambling book called "The Memoirs of a Picture" (London, 1805), devoted to a first-hand account of the life of George Morland. William Collins, R.A., died in 1847, leaving two sons, of whom Charles Allston Collins essayed both painting and literature with some success. Wilkie Collins, whose Christian name was given him in memory of his father's intimate friendship with his brother Academician, Sir David Wilkie, did not receive any very thorough education; he went first to a private school, then spent two years with his parents in Italy, then was articled to a firm in the tea trade, then became a student at Lincoln's Inn, and finally, after his father's death, found his true path in the profession of letters. His first work was a biography of his father, which was published in two volumes in 1848—a very respectable performance for a young and comparatively untrained man, but somewhat diffuse in style, and giving little promise of the future literary eminence of the author. In 1850 he published his first novel, "Antonina, or the Fall of Rome," a book inspired by his residence in Italy. Then followed several more books of little importance, and one, "Basil, a Story of Modern Life" (1852), which had a deserved success.

Soon after this Mr. Collins became intimately acquainted with Charles Dickens, and the friendship had a profound effect upon the whole of Collins's later life. He began to contribute to *Household Words*, and wrote in that magazine "After Dark" (1856) and "The Dead

Secret" (1857). "The Queen of Hearts" followed in 1859, but still the public, though they had learnt to know Collins's name, saw no reason to rank him among the leading novelists of the day. In 1860, however, he had a remarkable success on the publication of "The Woman in White," which had first appeared in *All the Year Round*.

In 1862 there followed "No Name," a curious story, which had a certain quality of its own. "Armada" came next, in 1866, having first appeared in the *Cornhill Magazine*; and then, in 1868, there followed the second of Collins's great successes, "The Moonstone," by many placed even higher than "The Woman in White." The stories that followed—"Man and Wife" (1870), "Poor Miss Finch" (1872), "Miss or Mrs.?" (1873), and several others—were popular, but in none of them, excepting in "The New Magdalen," did it seem that the standard once shown was maintained. He was a master of plot and a master of dramatic situations; his style was rather rapid and nervous than literary. He was fond of the theatre and of actors, his affection for them dating from the old days of Tavistock House and the days of his collaboration with Dickens. Often they acted together on the private stage, and, though they never actually wrote a play together, their tastes in this respect were alike. Of Collins's plays performed in public the most noteworthy were *The Frozen Deep* (1857), *The Moonstone* (1877), *Rank and Riches*, which failed in 1883, though it succeeded well in America, *The New Magdalen*, *The Woman in White*, and *Man and Wife*, the last of which was produced by Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft at the Prince of Wales's Theatre in Tottenham Street. Mr. Wilkie Collins was an indefatigable worker, almost equalling Anthony Trollope in the regularity if not in the fecundity of his writing. Quite through the summer he continued to work at a novel which was appearing at the time of his death, but he was struck down by paralysis, and although he rallied and for some months appeared in his usual health of mind and body, a sudden chill caught him, and he died on the 23rd at his

house in Wimpole Street, Cavendish Square.

Eliza Cook.—Eliza Cook, once a popular poetess and writer, died at Wimbledon on the 24th. She was the youngest of eleven children of a Southwark tradesman, and was born in the suburbs of South London on Christmas Eve, in the year 1818. Left at an early age without a mother, she was thrown upon her own resources; and although to a large extent self-taught, wrote verses which met with success as early as her fifteenth year. About the year 1838 her poems first found their way into the *Weekly Dispatch*, the *New Monthly*, the *Literary Gazette*, the *Metropolitan*, and other periodicals, and on the name of the author being revealed she at once found herself famous. In 1840 appeared her first volume of collected pieces, under the title of "Melaia, and other Poems," which speedily found a sale in America as well as in England, and in which the song of "The Old Arm Chair" was perhaps the most generally popular. She had already become a favourite, especially with the working classes, on account of the large-hearted, liberal, and philanthropic opinions which she expressed in verse: she more than sustained her reputation by the *Journal* which bore her name, and which she published weekly from 1849 down to 1864, when it was discontinued. It appealed to the tastes of the middle classes, showed an intimate acquaintance with their wants and feelings, their ways and habits of life, and a true sympathy with their love of hearth and home. She subsequently published "Jottings for My Journal" (1860), "New Echoes" (1864), and also a collection of her "Poetical Works," which has passed through many editions. Since then she has published little or nothing, and her reputation has faded away even among the classes who at one time were her greatest admirers. Of late years she had resided in a quiet cottage at South Wimbledon, where, in spite of ill-health, she would entertain her friends. Since 1864 she had been in receipt of a literary pension of 100*l.* a year.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 3rd, at Chamouni, aged 47, Joseph Firth Bottomley Firth, M.P., son of J. Bottomley, of Matlock. Born at Huddersfield; graduated LL.B. at the London University, having been called to the Bar in 1866; married, 1873, Elizabeth, youngest daughter of George Tatham, of Leeds. Sat as a Liberal for Chelsea, 1880-85, and for Dundee since 1887. He assumed the name of Firth by Royal licence in 1873. For many years took an active part in the movement for the Municipal Reform of London, and was appointed Deputy-Chairman of the London County Council on its forma-

tion in 1889. On the 4th, in Victoria street, aged 68, Edward Laman Blanchard, a writer of dramas, farces, and burlesques; the son of the late William Blanchard, one of the leading members of the Kemble company. On the 10th, at Château Marchais, near Laon, aged 69, Charles III., Prince of Monaco. He had been blind for some years and lived in retirement. On the same date, at Harting, Sussex, Michael Angelo Grattan Cooke, a son of Tom Cooke the composer; distinguished as an oboe player, and was for some years bandmaster of the 2nd Life Guards. On the 11th, from a fall from his horse, aged 37, the Hon. William John Fitzwilliam, fourth son of sixth Earl Fitzwilliam. Educated at Eton and Magdalene College, Cambridge; Lieutenant 1st West York Yeomanry Cavalry, and served in the Egyptian war as a volunteer, taking part in the advance from Ismailia to Cairo. Elected in 1878 for Peterborough, which place he represented as a Liberal-Conservative until his death. On the 12th, at Passy, near Paris, aged 59, Fustel de Coulanges, a member of the Institute, and a distinguished French writer. On the 22nd, at Lower Rickinghall Rectory, Suffolk, aged 67, Rev. Julius Shadwell, son of Sir Lancelot Shadwell, Vice-Chancellor of England. On the 23rd, at Upper Grosvenor Street, Reina Antoinette, Lady Bentinck, only daughter of Admiral Sir James Hawkins Whitehead, Bart., G.C.B.; married, 1829, General Sir John W. Bentinck, K.C.B., Colonel 28th Foot, who died in 1878. On the same date, aged 77, Sir George Kettilby Rickards, K.C.B., of Fyfield House, Oxford, eldest son of George Rickards, of Send Grove, Surrey. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1833, and was elected in 1837 Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and in the same year was called to the Bar of the Inner Temple. He was Professor of Political Economy at Oxford 1851-56, and Counsel to the Speaker of the House of Commons 1851-82. He married, first, 1842, Phoebe Frances, daughter of Rev. J. H. G. Lefroy, of Ewshote House, Hants; and second, 1881, Julia Cassandra, daughter of Rev. Benjamin Lefroy, Rector of Ashe, Hants. Also on the same date, at Eastbourne, aged 65, Admiral William Wood, last surviving son of General Sir William Wood, K.C.B., K.H. On the 24th, at Queen Anne's Gate, St. James's Park, Jane Margaret Dame Williams, daughter of Rev. Walter Bagot, of Pope Hall, Stafford, and widow of Sir Edward Vaughan Williams, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. On the same date, at Orchardlea, Droitwich, aged 69, the Ven. William Lea, Archdeacon of Worcester, educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1842. He was Vicar of St. Peter's Droitwich, 1849-1887; Hon. Canon of Worcester in 1858; and Archdeacon of Worcester in 1881. On the 26th, aged 42, Augustus, Duke of Coimbra, brother of King Louis of Portugal. On the 27th, at Auteuil, aged 59, José Maria Torres Caeado, a Spanish-American, who distinguished himself both as a man of letters and as a politician. In early life he was returned as Deputy to the Granada Congress, and subsequently filled some important diplomatic posts, retiring in 1864. On the 29th, aged 71, General Louis Léon César Faidherbe, a Senator, and Chancellor of the Legion of Honour. A distinguished French soldier; was, during the Franco-German war, Commander-in-Chief of the Army of the North, and for a time held the Germans in check. He had previously been Governor of Senegal, and amongst his writings are monographs connected with the archaeology of Upper Egypt. On the same date, in Portman Street, aged 71, General E. Wynyard, late of the Grenadier Guards, with whom he served in the Crimean War. He was Colonel of the East Yorkshire Regiment, and was the son of General E. B. Wynyard, of the 58th Regiment. On the 30th, at Ossington Hall, Nottinghamshire, aged 88, Charlotte Viscountess Ossington, the widow of John Evelyn Denison, Viscount Ossington, Speaker of the House of Commons 1857-72. She was the daughter of fourth Duke of Portland, and in 1882 assumed the name of Scott in right of her mother, a daughter of General John Scott, of Balcomie.

OCTOBER.

Sir William Tindal Robertson, K.B., M.P.—Born in 1825, the eldest son of Fredk. Fowler Robertson, of Grantham. He was educated for the medical profession at University College, London, and in 1846 received his degree of M.D. at the University of Edinburgh. In 1873 he was elected a Fellow of the

Royal College of Physicians, and began to practise at Brighton in 1876, where he also took a prominent part in politics. A few years later he altogether lost his sight, and, although forced to relinquish his profession, he rendered such signal services on the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the condition of

the blind, deaf, and dumb that he received the honour of Knighthood on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee. He married, in 1855, a daughter of Mr. John Leaven, of Nottingham. In 1886 he was returned unopposed as a Conservative, and was, in spite of his infirmity, active in the discharge of his parliamentary duties. His death, which happened on the 6th, was self-inflicted, the result of prolonged ill-health and mental depression.

The O'Donoghue of the Glens.—Daniel O'Donoghue, born in 1833, was the only child of Charles James O'Donoghue of the Glens, co. Tipperary, by Jane, only daughter of John O'Connell, of Grenn, and niece of the famous Daniel O'Connell. He represented the county Tipperary in Parliament from 1857-1865, and Tralee 1865-85. He married in 1858 Mary Sophie, daughter and co-heir of Sir John Ennis, first Bart., M.P. of Ballinahown, co. Westmeath, and died there on the 7th. The O'Donoghues of the Glens traced their descent from the royal family of Munster.

James Prescott Joule, who died at Sale, near Manchester, on the 11th, was born at Salford, Manchester, on Christmas Eve, 1818. He was so delicate that he could not be sent to school, and so was privately educated at home. Both his father and grandfather were brewers, and young Joule and his brother also entered the business, though James soon became so absorbed in scientific investigations that he practically left the brewery to others. Soon after entering the brewery, about the age of fifteen, he and his brother were sent by their father to the great chemist Dalton, the propounder of the atomic theory, in order to learn chemistry. He seems to have been at once caught with the enthusiasm for scientific research, and soon, with the rudest apparatus, began to make experiments of his own, mainly on the chemical constitution of gases and on the relations between chemical action and electricity. One of his first published papers was on a new electromagnetic engine, which he described at the age of nineteen. The amount and variety of his work since then may be inferred from the fact that in the Royal Society List there are the titles of ninety-seven papers, besides over twenty other important papers on researches undertaken by him in conjunction with Sir William Thomson, Sir Lyon Playfair, and Dr. Scoresby. In conducting his many experiments in electro-mag-

netism he had met with "the difficulty, if not impossibility, of understanding experiments and comparing them with one another, arising in general from incomplete descriptions of apparatus, and from the arbitrary and vague numbers used to characterise electric currents." He set himself to devise an accurate method of measuring a unit-quantity of electricity, which he took to be the quantity required to decompose nine grains of water. He went on to devise many improvements in galvanometers and to carry out a vast variety of ingenious experiments in the various aspects of electricity, and was thus led in 1841 and 1842 to lay the foundation of a new department of physical science—thermodynamics—in which so much good work has been done since. Meantime he had been speculating on the conversion of chemical energy into heat, and in 1840, 1841, and 1842 he gave accounts of a number of experiments, all leading up to the great discovery of the Mechanical Equivalent of Heat. This discovery in its earliest form was first announced at the Cork meeting of the British Association in 1843, in a paper on "The Calorific Effects of Magneto-Electricity, and on the Mechanical Value of Heat." Others at home and abroad had been working in the same direction, and, though at first it was slowly and somewhat grudgingly recognised by his fellow-students, Joule's discovery made its way surely, and is now recognised as one of the ruling constants of science. In a paper to the Royal Society in 1878 he gave the results of a fresh determination, according to which the quantity of work required to be expended in order to raise the temperature of 1 lb. of water, weighed in vacuum, from 60° to 61° Fahrenheit, is 772.55 foot-pounds of work, at the sea level, and in the latitude of Greenwich. Joule's great experiment has been repeated by many hands and in many forms and on great scales, but nothing has shaken the truth of the discovery. The practical results which have accrued from his theory have been of the most useful and beneficent kind. They have enabled our engineers to improve their machinery along lines of precision not otherwise attainable; while the amount saved in the application of heat must have amounted to millions. Joule continued his scientific investigations till very near the end of his long life. He lived the most retired life, partly from weak health and partly from his native modesty; and so it happens that one of the greatest of Darwin's contemporaries

was hardly known to the outside world. He was honoured, among those whose opinions alone he valued, at home and abroad. Gold medals and other marks of appreciation were showered upon him, including those of the Royal Society and Society of Arts. In 1878 her Majesty, through Lord Beaconsfield, conferred upon him a pension of 200*l.* a year. Dr. Joule married, in 1847, Miss Amelia Grimes, of Liverpool, who died in 1856. His name will for ever be associated with the discovery of the "Mechanical Equivalent of Heat."

Sir Daniel Gooch, Chairman of the Great Western Railway Company, died on the 15th, at his Berkshire residence, Clewer Park, near Windsor. Sir Daniel Gooch was of humble parentage, and was born in 1816 at Bedlington, Northumberland, where his father was employed in the iron works of Mr. Birkinshaw, who had just patented a new system of rolling malleable iron rails. George Stephenson, busy with improvements in "Puffing Billy" and surveys of the Stockton and Darlington line, was a frequent visitor at his father's house, from Killingworth, only ten miles off. It was at Stephenson and Pease's Forth Street Works in Newcastle that Daniel Gooch served his apprenticeship to practical engineering, and it was under Robert Stephenson that he was employed in the locomotive works at Warrington when, at the early age of twenty-one, Brunel recommended him to the directors for the appointment of locomotive superintendent of the Great Western Railway. This appointment Daniel Gooch held for twenty-seven years. Young as he was, he took rank from the first as one of the leaders of his profession. His "North Star," still to be seen at Swindon, was a marvel of symmetry and compactness to have been turned out in 1838. The engines that have worked broad-gauge expresses have been practically unaltered from what they were when he completed the first of the class, the "North Briton," in 1846. Nor has the speed that the "North Briton" and her companions attained been bettered since, though the "race to Edinburgh" of 1888 was almost as keen a fight as the "battle of the gauges" forty years earlier. To Mr. Gooch the engineering world owed the most accurate information so far obtained as to atmospheric resistance, internal friction, rolling friction, and the like questions.

In 1864 Mr. Gooch, as he then was, retired from the service of the Great

Western, in order to devote his attention to the establishment of telegraphic communication between England and America. In this object he succeeded; it was he who despatched the first telegraphic message across the Atlantic, and his success was rewarded with a baronetcy; and he remained till his death Chairman of the Telegraphic Construction and Maintenance Company and director of several other cable undertakings. He was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Wiltshire, a leading Freemason, and he sat in Parliament in 1865-85 as a Conservative member for Cricklade. As a proof of his financial shrewdness, he was one of the very few people who ever had anything to do with the unfortunate 'Great Eastern' without regretting it. But during the years the great ship was employed laying submarine cable she returned her owners, of whom Sir Daniel Gooch was one, a steady 20 per cent.

The most important feat of his life was yet to follow. He had only been away from the Great Western for a twelvemonth when he was summoned back to assume the position of chairman, and rescue the company from imminent bankruptcy. At that time Great Western stock was at 38½, the general manager (Mr. Gurnson) fully expected that "next Monday morning the railway will be in the hands of a receiver," and it was esteemed a triumph of management when the new chairman succeeded in staving off the most pressing creditors by the issue of 6 per cent. debentures at a heavy discount. That the Great Western emerged from this distressful plight, that it absorbed the Bristol and Exeter, the South Devon, the Cornwall, and twenty railways more, till it became not only the largest, but one of the most compact and prosperous of English railways, was owing very largely to the upright and able management of Sir Daniel Gooch. The Severn Tunnel, more especially by which the scattered members of the Great Western Railway have been knit together, could never have been made but for his perseverance and faith in its ultimate success. He married, first, in 1838, Margaret, daughter of Henry Tanner, of Bishopwearmouth, and, second, in 1870, Margaret, daughter of John Burder, of Norwood.

John David FitzGerald was the son of David FitzGerald, of Dublin, by his wife Catherine, eldest daughter of David Leahy, of London. He was born in Dublin in 1816, and, though a Roman

Catholic, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He was called to the Irish Bar in 1838, and went the Munster Circuit, of which, after becoming Queen's Counsel in 1847, he was for several years the leader. He made a reputation early in his career, and rapidly obtained a large practice. In 1852 he entered Parliament as Liberal member for Ennis. Three years later he was appointed Solicitor-General for Ireland, and became Attorney-General for Ireland in 1856. This latter office he held for two short periods, 1856-8 and 1859-60, and in the last year he was appointed third Justice of the Queen's Bench (Ireland). From this time he was, of course, only before the public as a Judge; but his reputation extended far beyond the limits of his Court. He was learned and temperate; his fairness was proverbial; his dignity was such as to enhance that of the Bench of which he was a member. He was, in a word, from the very first among the most noteworthy of the Irish Judges. He was engaged in very many of the most important cases, especially in the trials of Fenian prisoners at Dublin and Cork in 1865, 1866, and 1867. He was, above all, the principal Judge in the great State trials of January 1881, when Messrs. Parnell, Biggar, Dillon, Sexton, Patrick Egan, P. J. Sheridan, and others were indicted for seditious conspiracy. His colleagues were Lord Chief Justice May and Mr. Justice Barry, but before the trial began, the Chief Justice withdrew, on the ground that some remarks of his had been twisted by the popular press into an expression of opinion hostile to the defendants. Thus Mr. Justice FitzGerald was left to preside over the Court. His conduct throughout the twenty days of the trial was such as to command the respect even of the friends of the traversers. His charge, however, was a severe condemnation of the Land League, which, he said, "had obtained and exercised a tremendous social power; in some places so powerful that the Queen's writ was of no avail." This statement of the law had no effect upon the majority of the Dublin jury. After six and a half hours' deliberation, the jury was discharged without coming to an agreement, and the Government was forced to apply to Parliament for fresh powers to cope with the unlawful actions of the League.

In May, 1882, Mr. Justice FitzGerald was appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, with a life peerage. He took the title of Baron FitzGerald, of Kilmarnock, in the county of Dublin. From

that time he was constant in his attendance at the House of Lords, whenever judicial business has had to be done; and his high reputation as a lawyer and a Judge has been steadily sustained. Moreover, he took part in many of the ordinary debates in the House of Lords on political matters; for though he never allowed his judgments to be biased by politics, he was keenly interested in them, especially where Ireland was concerned. He sat in the House of Commons as a Liberal; but he refused to follow Mr. Gladstone when the surrender was made to Home Rule and the Parnellites. From that time Lord FitzGerald became a strong supporter of the Unionist party; and his unrivalled knowledge of Ireland, its history, its actual condition, and the mental and moral constitution of its inhabitants—made his adherence very important. Personally he was everything that was most charming. Of a keen intelligence, but genial and courteous in the extreme, his society was eagerly sought for, and all that he said had weight. He had a plentiful supply of Irish humour, though he fortunately never posed as a humourist on the bench. His experience of Ireland and his love for the country were great; and, indeed, those who best know Ireland always speak of him as a man whose observation, memory, and reading made his judgment on Irish matters of the highest value.

Lord FitzGerald was twice married—first, in 1846, to Rose, daughter of John O'Donohoe; secondly, in 1860, four years after his first wife's death, to the Hon. Jane Southwell; sister of the fourth Viscount Southwell. He died on the 16th, at the residence of his brother, in Fitzwilliam Place, Dublin, after a very short illness.

King Luis I. of Portugal.—Louis Philippe Marie Ferdinand Pierre d'Alcantara Antoine Michel Raphael Gabriel Gonzague Xavier François d'Assise Jean Jules Auguste Volfando de Bragança Bourbon, was the second but eldest surviving son of Donna Maria II. da Gloria, Queen of Portugal, and Dom Fernando, Prince of Saxe-Coburg. He was born in Oct. 1838, and visited England with his elder brother in 1854, when he bore the title of Duke of Oporto. Some time after this he attained the rank of captain in the Portuguese navy. In 1861 his brother, King Pedro V., succumbed to an attack of fever, which also carried off another brother, and Dom Luis succeeded to the throne. His Majesty married on Oct. 6, 1862, Pia, youngest daughter

of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, by whom he had two sons—Carlos, born Sep. 28, 1863, and Alfonso, born July 31, 1865.

Luis I. proved himself a sagacious ruler, and although for some time after his accession he was unable to form a stable Government, of late years the peace and prosperity of Portugal have been uninterrupted. The last insurrection which occurred was that headed by the veteran conspirator, the Duke de Saldanha, in 1870. In no respect did King Luis display his prudence more than by the deaf ear he turned to the schemes and machinations of General Prim for the union of Spain and Portugal under the House of Braganza. The marriage of the King's son and heir, Dom Carlos, to the daughter of the Comte de Paris in 1886 attracted considerable attention, and, while it was probably devoid of political significance, the conduct of the French Government gave it a sort of international importance. In the same year as this marriage the King paid a second visit to England.

Dom Luis was a friend of reform, as was evidenced by his conversion of the Portuguese Upper House from an hereditary assembly to one of life members. He was also distinguished for his culture and his high literary tastes. In 1877 he published a translation into Portuguese of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This was followed in 1880 by a translation of the *Merchant of Venice*. In that year, likewise, he completed his translation of *Richard III.* A second edition of his Majesty's translation of *Hamlet* was issued in 1880. The first edition was limited to 1,000 copies, which the King distributed among his friends. An unscrupulous publisher in Rio de Janeiro, however, struck off a cheap edition, which secured a very remunerative sale in the Brazilian capital. In order to prevent a repetition of this conduct, the King made a present of the copyright of the new edition of *Hamlet* and of his future translations of Shakespeare to one of the charitable asylums of Lisbon. He had for many months been in failing health, and towards the close a very great sufferer. The death, too, of his only surviving brother, Augustine, Duke of Coimbra, produced a depressing effect upon a mind and body worn out by suffering. He died on the 9th, at his summer palace outside Lisbon.

Viscount Torrington. — George Stanley Byng, eighth Viscount Torrington, who died at Dinard, France, on the

20th, was third son of Major the Hon. Robert Barlow Palmer Byng, third son of sixth Viscount Byng. He entered the army in 1857, and joined the Rifle Brigade, with which corps he saw service in the Indian Mutiny, and in the Zulu Campaign, 1878-79. He was aide-de-camp and private secretary to the Duke of Marlborough when Viceroy of Ireland, 1879-80, and was subsequently a Lord-in-Waiting to the Queen. He married, first (1882), Alice Arabella, daughter of James Jameson, of Airfield, co. Dublin, and, second, in 1885, Emmeline St. Maur, daughter of Rev. Henry Somerset, Rector of Holme, Pierrepont.

Earl of Orkney.—George William Hamilton Fitz-Maurice, Earl of Orkney, Viscount of Kirkwall, and Baron of Dechmont, in the peerage of Scotland, and a Scotch representative peer, was the eldest son of Thomas, fifth earl, by the Hon. Charlotte Isabella Irby, second daughter of George, third Lord Boston, and was born in 1827. He entered the army as ensign in the 92nd Highlanders in August, 1845, became lieutenant in November the following year, captain in November, 1853, afterwards exchanging into the 71st Foot, with which regiment he served at the siege of Sebastopol and the capture of Kertch, and for his services received the medal and clasp and the Turkish medal. In 1856 he entered the Scots Fusiliers, but retired from the army the following year. He served as aide-de-camp to Sir Henry Ward, G.C.M.G. (Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands), from 1851 to 1854; was nominated a C.M.G. in 1866, advanced to K.C.M.G. in 1875; was Grand Commander of the Order of the Saviour of Greece, and was also a Knight of the Medjidie of the fifth class. The late earl succeeded to the family honours on the death of his father in May, 1877, having previously, in Nov., 1872, married Amelia, Baroness de Samuel, widow of Baron de Samuel, a peer of Portugal. The deceased earl was elected a representative peer for Scotland in 1885, and was appointed a deputy-lieutenant of Ayrshire in 1852. He died at his residence, Sussex Place, Regent's Park, on the 21st.

Mr. John Ball, F.R.S.—John Ball was born in Dublin in 1818, and was the eldest son of a man of much note in his day, the Right Hon. Nicholas Ball, formerly M.P. for Clonmel, Attorney-General for Ireland, and afterwards one of the Judges of the Common Pleas. He was one of the most liberal-minded

of Catholics, and sent his son to Christ's College, Cambridge—a very unusual step in those days. John Ball came out a wrangler, but could not, under the statutes then in force, take a degree. He joined the Irish Bar, and soon after was appointed Assistant Poor Law Commissioner; and during the famine he laid the foundation of his intimate friendship with Mr. W. E. Forster. He remained an official of the Poor Law Board till 1852, when at the general election he resigned, and offered himself for county Carlow as a Liberal candidate. After a hard fight he was returned; and he at once made some mark in the House of Commons. He supported what then seemed a somewhat advanced land programme; opposed all interference with convents; and supported Mr. Gladstone's proposal (1853) to extend the income-tax to Ireland. In 1855, on the formation of Lord Palmerston's Government, he was made Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and held this office till the general election of 1858. At that time, however, a cloud was rising on the horizon which gravely disturbed the Catholic constituencies, though the rest of the world knew little of it as yet. This was the Italian question. The Irish priests foresaw the coming struggle, and demanded that their candidates should take sides with the Papacy and the Duchies against Piedmont and the Revolution. This John Ball, though a good Catholic, refused to do; and he was therefore opposed by the priests and,

after a hard struggle, was defeated. He at once withdrew from public life, and flung himself, with an ardour very unusual in a man of middle age, into scientific pursuits. He was a passionate traveller. He married an Italian wife, and began to explore—it may almost be said to discover—Switzerland. The first volume of his "Alpine Guide" appeared in 1860, and at once asserted its great superiority over anything else of the kind in existence. The three volumes were completed in 1865. In one of the intervals of Swiss travel Mr. Ball accompanied Sir Joseph Hooker into Morocco, and the result was the well-known "Tour in Morocco, and the Great Atlas," which will probably long remain the standard authority for that region, especially for the botany of it. Ball, indeed, though he was a late recruit to the science, had all the qualifications of a botanist—enthusiasm, patience, and the gift of careful observation and sound inference. He was not content with the Alps, or even with the Atlas; he laid under contribution the Andes as well. Many of his papers in the Linnean Society's journal and other records deal with the flora of Patagonia and Peru; and it was but last year that he spent months at Teneriffe. He had passed the autumn in the Dolomites, where he seems to have over-exerted himself, for on his return, having to undergo an operation, he sank on the 21st, at his home in Southwell Gardens, almost before danger was apprehended.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 2nd, in Hill Street, aged 89, Emily Frances, widow of Henry, seventh Duke of Beaufort, and daughter of Culling Charles Smith, of Hampton, Middlesex, who had married Lady Anne Wellesley, daughter of the first Duke of Wellington. On the same date, at Bath, aged 75, Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Scott Hawkins, late of the Royal Scots, with which regiment he served in the Eastern campaign of 1864-5. He was the son of the late Sir Cesar Hawkins, and married, in 1873, Fanny Cecilia, daughter of Evan Williams, of Duffryn Frwd, Glamorganshire. On the 6th, drowned in a gale at Lough Derg, aged 54, Colonel Hans Garrett Moore, V.C., C.B., son of Garrett of Annabeg, co. Galway, Colonel Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, served with 88th Foot in the Indian Mutiny, and in the Egyptian war of 1882. He was repeatedly mentioned in despatches, and was awarded the Victoria Cross for gallant conduct in the Caffre war of 1877. On the 7th, at Orche Hill, Bucks, aged 86, Lady Charlotte Jane Blount, widow of Mr. Wm. Blount, of Orleton, Herefordshire, and eldest daughter of eleventh Duke of Somerset by his first wife, daughter of ninth Duke of Hamilton and Brandon. On the same date, aged 79, General Lebrun, a French General who served in the Crimea with distinction, and during the Franco-Prussian war, in command of an army corps, defended Bazeilles against the Bavarians. Also on the same date, at Tottenham, aged 71, James Robertson, superintendent and traffic manager of the Great Eastern Railway. Born at Blair Athol, Perthshire, he began life as an engineer on turnpike roads and bridges at Inverness, under Mr. Joseph Mitchell. On the introduction of railways he came to London, and was employed by Sir Joseph Lake for the South-Western Railway, and rose to be his chief assistant. In 1851 he was appointed manager of the Greenock Railway, and remained in Scotland until 1856, when he was appointed superintendent at Bishops-gate Station of the Eastern Counties Railway. During his tenure of the post he

introduced the new system of block working and signalling, and on the transfer of the terminus to Liverpool Street perfected the scheme of the new Metropolitan line there united. On the 9th, in Grosvenor Street, aged 78, Sir Benjamin Samuel Phillips, a leading member of the Jewish community in London; Lord Mayor of London, 1866, on which occasion he was knighted. On the 13th, at Upper Clapton, aged 83, Stafford Allen, a member of the Society of Friends, and one of the last surviving contemporaries of Wilberforce, Clarkson, Brougham, and Buxton, and a fellow-labourer with them in the cause of the abolition of slavery. On the 15th, at Birkby Lodge, Huddersfield, aged 71, Sir Charles William Sikes, the second son of Shakespear Sikes, banker, of Huddersfield. He was the first to advocate the establishment of penny banks in connection with mechanics' institutes, and he took an important part in the foundation of the Post Office Savings Bank, and was knighted (1881) in recognition of his services in the cause. On the 16th, at Minster House, Cerne, Dorchester, aged 80, Edward St. Vincent, ninth Baron Digby, eldest son of Admiral Sir Henry Digby, G.C.B. He succeeded, in 1856, to the Irish barony of his cousin Edward, second Earl Digby; was for some time in the army. Married, 1837, Lady Theresa Fox-Strangways, eldest daughter of third Earl of Ilchester. On the same date, at Mount Wolseley, co. Carlow, aged 52, Sir Clement James Wolseley, seventh baronet, a barrister of the Middle Temple, and a member of the Irish Bar; married, 1872, Constance L., daughter of Major-General R. Parker Radcliffe, R.A. Also on the same date, at Eastbourne, aged 78, General William Samuel Newton, late of 89th Foot; served with the Coldstream Guards in the Crimea, son of William Newton, of Elveden, Suffolk. On the 18th, at Norwood, General John Ramsay Stuart, C.B., Colonel of 2nd Dorsetshire Regiment, and late of 21st Fusiliers. He was the son of Rev. John Stuart, of Blair Athole, N.B., entered the Scots Fusiliers in 1832, and retired as General in 1880. He was frequently mentioned in despatches, and distinguished himself in the command of his regiment at the battle of Inkerman. Married, 1849, Lillian Oswald, daughter of Andrew Mitchell, of Maweside, Ayrshire. On the 20th, in Ennismore Gardens, aged 72, Sir John Blosset Maule, Q.C.; called to the Bar, 1847; Recorder of Leeds, 1861-80, when he was made Director of Public Prosecutions. As Treasurer of the Inner Temple he was knighted on the occasion of the opening of the Royal Courts of Justice in 1881. On the 22nd, at Hillsborough, near Ross, Herefordshire, aged 94, Colonel Basil Jackson, the son of Major Basil Jackson, born at Glasgow, June 27, 1795; entered the Royal Military School, 1808, and, having received his commission, was at once transferred to the Royal Staff College. He was attached to the Quartermaster-General's staff in Holland and Belgium during the campaign of 1814 and 1815, and whilst serving under the Duke of Wellington did good service in clearing the roads. He accompanied the allied army to Paris, and was selected to go with Napoleon to St. Helena, where he remained until 1823. He was subsequently employed in Nova Scotia and Canada, and took part in the construction of the Rideau Canal, and on his return was appointed Professor of Military Surveying at Addiscombe College, where he remained for twenty years. On the same date, at Glenfernen, Dumfries, aged 72, Alexander Leslie-Melville, twelfth Earl of Leven and Melville, from the effects of a carriage accident. Educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. He was partner in the banking firms of Williams, Deacon & Co., of London, and of Neville, Reid & Co., of Windsor, and a representative peer for Scotland. On the 24th, at Hammesmith, aged 75, Percival Leigh, one of the earliest writers for *Punch*, with which journal he continued until his death. On the same date, at Nice, William Doria, a member of the diplomatic service, who, beginning his career as a student attaché at Constantinople in 1841, passed into the regular diplomatic line, and served for many years in the East. He subsequently served in South America and at various European Courts, retiring in 1877. On the 25th, at Croissy, near Paris, aged 69, Emile Augier, a distinguished dramatist and a member of the French Academy. On the 26th, at Tower House, Shooter's Hill, aged 91, George Henry Roper-Curzon, sixteenth Baron Teynham. Educated at Westminster and Woolwich, from whence he passed into the Royal Artillery; married, first, 1822, Eliza Joynes, and, second, 1873, Elizabeth, only daughter of William Jay, Esq. On the 27th, in Sussex Gardens, aged 88, General Charles Hamilton, C.B.; educated at Addiscombe; entered the Bengal Army, 1818, with which he had served in the Gwalior campaign of 1843 and in the Sutlej campaign two years later. On the same date, at Malvern Wells, William Burgess, the founder and proprietor of the Midland Counties Fish Culture Establishment. Also on the same date, at Appley Towers, Isle of Wight, aged 80, Major-General Sir George Hutt, K.C.B., secretary and registrar to the Com-

missioners of Chelsea Hospital, 1865-87, youngest son of the late Richard Hutt, of Appley Towers. He entered the Bombay Artillery in 1826, and retired in 1858, having served in the Scinde-Afghan Campaigns of 1839-44, and in the Indian Mutiny. He married, 1862, Adela Scott, daughter of Lieutenant Sir John Scott, G.C.B., Colonel of 7th Hussars. On the 28th, in Bolton Gardens, S.W., aged 74, William Westgarth, son of John Westgarth, Surveyor-General of Customs for Scotland. In early life he emigrated to Australia, and obtained a leading position in the mercantile community of Melbourne. On his return to London in 1854 he commenced business as a colonial broker, and was the author of several works on Australia. On the 29th, in Inverness Terrace, W., aged 89, Colonel Joseph Walker Jasper Ouseley, of the late Bengal Army (retired). He was a learned Oriental scholar, and for upwards of sixty years was engaged in teaching Eastern languages, first at the Fort William College at Calcutta, and subsequently at the East India College at Haileybury.

NOVEMBER,

Evelyn, sixth Viscount Falmouth who died at Mereworth Castle, Maidstone, on the 6th, was born on March 19, 1819, and was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. He succeeded his cousin, at whose death the earldom, created in 1821, became extinct, as Viscount Falmouth in 1852, having married in 1845 Mary Frances Elizabeth, 28rd Baroness Le Despencer in her own right. Brought up for the Bar, Lord Falmouth, when he unexpectedly inherited the ancestral titles and estates, did not at first keep many horses, and the few which he did own ran under an assumed name. In 1862, however, he won the One Thousand Guineas with Hurricane, a daughter of Wild Dayrell, the Derby winner of 1855, and his horses were at that time trained in John Scott's famous stable at Malton. In the year following "Mr. Valentine" won the Oaks with Queen Bertha, who afterwards ran second to Lord Clifden for the St. Leger. It was said that Queen Bertha was the only horse Lord Falmouth ever made a bet about, and the story is that he bet the trainer's wife sixpence that his mare would not win, and that, having lost his bet, he presented her with the sixpence as a brooch set in diamonds. Queen Bertha became in her turn the dam of Queen's Messenger, Spinaway, and Wheel of Fortune, three of the best horses bred by Lord Falmouth, who not long after this moved to Newmarket, and became the principal employer of Matt. Dawson at Heath House.

His first Derby was in 1870, when Kingcraft, thanks to the breakdown of Macgregor during the race, beat one of the worst fields that ever contested the Epsom prize. Kingcraft was but a poor specimen of the Derby winner, and his subsequent career was in-

glorious; but it was from this period that "the Falmouth epoch" may be said to have begun. He won a number of valuable prizes with the two-year-old Queen's Messenger in 1871. In 1873 he won the One Thousand Guineas with Cecilia; and in 1874 Atlantic, a son of his first great winner, Hurricane, carried off the Two Thousand Guineas, and was the first of the many winners of important races ridden by F. Archer, whom Lord Falmouth was mainly instrumental in bringing before the public. Atlantic broke a blood-vessel while running for the Derby, but during the same season of 1874, Spinaway, a daughter of Lord Falmouth's favourite mare Queen Bertha, was winning a number of two-year-old races and foreshadowing her double triumph in the One Thousand Guineas and the Oaks—a triumph repeated by her own daughter, Busybody, nine years later. Two years after this Lord Falmouth may be said to have reached the zenith of his good fortune, for he won both the Derby and St. Leger of 1877 with Silvio, a horse he subsequently sold to a French breeder for 7,000 guineas. During the season of 1878 Wheel of Fortune, another daughter of Queen Bertha, won all her two-year-old engagements; and in 1879 she carried off the One Thousand Guineas, the Oaks, and the Prince of Wales's Stakes at Ascot. This was the best racehorse that Lord Falmouth ever owned, but she broke down at York, and was unable to run for the St. Leger. However, Lord Falmouth had scored a very unexpected victory in the Two Thousand Guineas the same year with Charibert, one of the last of the Thormanbys, while during the years 1880 and 1881 the two-year-olds Bal Gal and Dutch Oven carried nearly all before them. Their winnings,

including a most sensational victory of Dutch Oven in the St. Leger of 1882, when she beat the two mares successful in the Derby and the Oaks, amounted to 30,000*l.*; and the last of Lord Falmouth's "classic" winners was Galliard, who in 1883 carried off the Two Thousand Guineas. Galliard failed to stand his training for the St. Leger, but during that same season Lord Falmouth had two brilliant two-year-olds in Harvester and Busybody, the latter of whom won his first and last Middle Park Plate.

In 1884 Lord Falmouth suddenly decided to sell off all his racehorses, and break up the magnificent breeding stud at Mereworth, near Maidstone. Some people believed that it was because he had his suspicions as to the way in which Galliard had run for the Derby of the previous year. Others assigned the step to failing health, and, as a matter of fact, Lord Falmouth has not since then often been seen upon a racecourse. The twenty-four horses in training fetched 36,420 guineas, or nearly 1,850 guineas each, two of them making 17,400 guineas. One of these was Harvester, who, sold to Sir J. Willoughby for 8,600 guineas, ran a dead heat with St. Gatien for the Derby, while the other was Busybody, whom Mr. G. Baird bought for 8,600 guineas, and with whom he won both the One Thousand Guineas and the Oaks. Two months later the second portion of his breeding-stud, comprising twenty-five mares and foals, realised 50,200 guineas; sixteen yearlings, 18,350 guineas; and five stallions, 7,350 guineas, making a total of 75,900 guineas, which, added to the sum received for the horses in training, amounted to over 110,000 guineas. He also received one-third of the stakes won by the racehorses which he had sold when they ran in engagements made by him, and he had the further satisfaction of seeing the best animals nearly all retained for English studs. Lord Falmouth had won in stakes, since he first began to race, upwards of 300,000*l.*, while from 1872 to 1883 he had never won less than 10,000*l.*, the figures being 10,000*l.* in 1872, 10,000*l.* in 1873, 16,000*l.* in 1874, 21,000*l.* in 1875, 10,000*l.* in 1876, 30,000*l.* in 1877, 38,000*l.* in 1878, 24,000*l.* in 1879, 16,000*l.* in 1880, 14,000*l.* in 1881, 13,000*l.* in 1882, and 18,000*l.* in 1883. This is about 220,000*l.*; and the 38,000*l.* credited to him in 1878 was the largest sum ever won by a single owner of horses until the monster stakes of modern days were introduced. After

the sale of his stud he made a fresh start, but upon a much smaller scale; and Seabreeze and Blanchland were the only two racers of any note owned by Lord Falmouth during his later years.

Edwin Hatch, D.D., Rector of Purleigh, in Essex, died at his residence in Oxford, on the 10th, from a combined attack of pleurisy and heart disease. Dr. Hatch was in the fifty-fifth year of his age. He had been educated at King Edward's School, Birmingham, and was afterwards a scholar of Pembroke College, Oxford. He took a second class in classics in 1857, and obtained the Ellerton Prize in 1858. After a residence in Canada as Professor and head of a College, he returned to Oxford in 1867 and became the Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, a post which he held until he was appointed in 1855 Reader in Ecclesiastical History to the University. At the time of his death he was engaged on two unfinished works—(1) the Hibbert Lectures for the year 1887, of which the subject was the connection of Greek philosophy with early Christianity; (2) a Concordance to the Septuagint—a work to which he devoted the best years of his life. Of the first of these two works the greater part, and of the second several sheets, were already in print. His other writings comprise the Bampton Lectures, delivered in 1880, which have received the singular honour of being translated into German by his friend Professor Harnack, and a volume of essays on Biblical Greek, published at the beginning of this year. He was also the author of innumerable articles in reviews, magazines, and dictionaries.

Major Peter Egerton Warburton, C.M.G., whose death, at Beaumont, Adelaide, South Australia, took place on the 15th—a younger son of Rev. Rowland Egerton Warburton—was born at Arley Hall, Northwich, Cheshire, in 1813, was educated at Paris and Orleans, and entered the navy in 1825. In 1829 he went into the East India Company's service, and in 1835 was appointed adjutant of the Marine Battalion at Bombay. He received his next appointment as acting deputy-adjutant-general, and retired from the service with the rank of major in 1853. He then visited Australia, accepting a post in the Civil Service of South Australia. In 1858 he was appointed Commissioner of Police. He occupied this post until 1869, when he was given the Colonel Commandantship of the South Australian Volunteer Force. Major Warburton's great work,

however, was connected with various exploring expeditions in Central Australia. His principal and most recent exploration was that which was undertaken in 1873, when he succeeded in crossing the continent from a point on the overland telegraphic line to the De Grey River, in Western Australia, passing *en route* through the terrible tract of country known as the Sandy Desert. When the overland telegraph line was completed in 1872, the question of the character and the capabilities of the country in Central Australia was very prominently brought up, and the South Australian Government encouraged enterprises in this direction and associated themselves with the work. Between 1872 and 1875 three explorers were sent out—namely, Major Warburton, Mr. Ernest Giles, and Mr. W. C. Gosse. Major Warburton started westward from Alice Springs, with a party of men and thirty camels. Many months elapsed, and grave misgivings were felt as to the fate of the expedition. At length, after about twelve months' silence, a member of his party appeared at one of the northern stations in Western Australia and reported that the gallant explorer was camped near De Grey River, with no provisions but camel's flesh, and with very little of that. The party endured terrible hardships in forcing their way across the desert, and their privations told heavily upon them. At the close of the expedition Major Warburton visited England and was awarded a gold medal of the Royal Geographical Society for his efforts towards increasing our knowledge of the interior of Australia. He received the Companionship of the Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1875.

Mr. William Allingham, whose death, on the 18th, took place at his residence, Eldon House, Lyndhurst Road, Hampstead, was long held in esteem as a graceful and sympathetic author of poems which have the merit of true originality. Though of English descent, he was born, on March 19, 1824, at Ballyshannon, county Donegal, and for some time held a post in the Customs in Ireland. He contributed first to the *Athenæum*, *Household Words*, and other literary journals, but in 1850 published a volume of poems, followed by "Day and Night Songs" in 1854; a collection of choice lyrics called "Night-ingle Valley" in 1862; "Fifty Modern Poems" in 1865; and in 1869 "Lawrence Bloomfield in Ireland," a narrative poem illustrating the difficulties of the agrarian problem and the relations between land-

lords and peasants in that country. This work first appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*. An edition of his "Flower Pieces," part of "Day and Night Songs," was accompanied with designs by D. G. Rossetti; and "Life and Phantasies," by Arthur Hughes and Sir J. E. Maillais. Mr. Allingham in 1872 edited "The Ballad Book," a collection of the best British ballads. In 1874 he became editor of *Fraser's Magazine*, for which he wrote many prose articles, including travels in various parts, under the pseudonym of Patricius Walker. His "Songs, Ballads, and Stories," published in 1877, comprising revised versions of many of his earlier pieces, with others in addition, were received with increasing public favour. Another volume contained "Thought and Word," and a play called "Ashby Manor," with four scenes drawn by Mrs. Allingham, who was Miss Helen Paterson, a water-colour artist of high repute, and an Associate of the Society of Painters in Water-Colours: this lady was married to Mr. Allingham in 1874. An historical play, "The Evil May-day," also proved his talent as a dramatist.

Lord Blackford, G.C.M.G., P.C., who died on the 21st at his seat near Ivybridge, Devon, was the eldest son of Sir Frederick Leman Rogers, seventh baronet of that name and family, and was born in 1811. Henry Rogers was educated at Eton, and at Ornel College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1832, obtaining a double first in the old and celebrated curriculum inaugurated by Sir Robert Peel and illustrated by so many men who have risen to the highest eminence in Church and State. In addition to his achievements in the schools, Mr. Rogers obtained as an undergraduate the Craven University Scholarship, and carried off the Vinerian Scholarship and Fellowship after he had taken his degree. He was called to the Bar in 1836, and devoted himself to professional and literary pursuits. He became a frequent contributor to the *Times*, and in 1846 he took an active part, with the late Professor Mountague Bernard and other friends, in the foundation of the *Guardian* newspaper. In 1845 he had been appointed Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, and in the following year he became one of the Commissioners of Lands and Emigration. Ten years later he was nominated Assistant Commissioner for the Sale of Encumbered Estates in the West Indies, and having thus, by his several employments in connection with colonial affairs, been brought into close relations with the

Colonial Office, he was in 1859 appointed by the Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State for the Colonies in the Government of Lord Palmerston, to the post of Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in succession to the late Mr. Herman Merivale. Sir Henry Rogers, who had succeeded to his father's title on the death of the latter in 1851, retained his post at the Colonial Office until 1871, when he retired with the rank of a Privy Counsellor, conferred on him in recognition of his eminent public services, and was raised to the peerage as Baron Blachford, of Blachford, near Ivybridge, in Devon. Sir Frederick Rogers, who was made a K.C.M.G. in 1859, and promoted in 1873 to the rank of G.C.M.G., served at the Colonial Office under six successive Secretaries of State—namely, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Cardwell, Lord Carnarvon, the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Granville, and Lord Kimberley. The most memorable event of his period of office was the foundation of the Dominion of Canada, which was effected in 1867 during the Secretaryship of Lord Carnarvon. After his retirement from the Colonial Office Lord Blachford took little active part in public affairs. He served, however, as Chairman of the Royal Commission appointed in 1881 to inquire into the condition of the London hospitals for small pox and fever cases, and into the means of preventing the spread of infection. Lord Blachford married, in 1847, Georgiana May, daughter of Mr. Andrew Colville, of Ochiltree and Craighflower, N.B.

Mr. Martin Farquhar Tupper, the eldest son of a well-known doctor, Mr. Martin Tupper, F.R.S. (who twice refused a baronetcy), was born in London in 1810, and was educated at the Charterhouse and Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1832, M.A. in 1835, and D.C.L. in 1847. After obtaining his degree, Mr. Tupper entered as a student at Lincoln's Inn, and was called to the bar in 1835, but never practised as a barrister. In 1836 appeared his first work, "Geraldine and other Poems," and the same year the first half of his famous "Proverbial Philosophy" was written in his chambers at 21 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn. The original edition attained but a moderate amount of success, while its

first appearance in America was almost a failure; but as it began to grow in estimation the demand increased year by year, so that for twenty-five years there were never sold less than 5,000 copies annually. The "Proverbial Philosophy" was lengthened into four series (1839-67), some of which went through more than fifty editions. It was computed that in less than a quarter of a century the circulation of this work was upwards of one hundred thousand copies in England, and nearly half a million in America, while it was also translated into several Continental languages. Among other early works by Mr. Tupper were "A Septuagint of Worthies," published in 1839, "An Author's Mind" (1841), "The Crook of Gold," "Heart," and "Twins," all of which were published in 1844, and went through numerous editions. Then followed in rapid succession "Hactenus" and "A Thousand Lines," 1848; "Surrey," being a rapid review of its principal personages and places, 1849; "King Alfred's Poems in English Metres," 1850, with many others; and a biographical novel entitled "Stephen Langton," which was described as a perfect pre-Raphaelite reproduction of Old England in the days of King John. In 1858 appeared "Paterfamilias's Diary of Everybody's Tour," and in 1861 the "Rides and Reveries of Mr. Æsop Smith," edited by Peter Query, Esq. Mr. Tupper was an early friend to the colonisation of Liberia, and he also gave a gold medal for the encouragement of African literature; while as regards the Rifle Volunteer movement he was one of its earliest and warmest supporters.

Mr. Tupper early received distinctions from many foreign sovereigns, and he was likewise awarded the Prussian Gold Medal for Science and Art. In 1835 he married Isabella, only daughter of Mr. A. W. Davis. In 1845 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. His later publications included "Three Hundred Sonnets," 1860, "Cithara Lyrics," 1863; "Raleigh, his Life and Death," an historical play, 1866; "Washington," a drama, 1876; "Miscellaneous Poems," 1880; and "My Life as an Author," 1886, together with many articles, reviews, and fugitive pieces in prose and verse. In 1883 he was presented with a public testimonial. He died, on the 29th, at Sydenham, after a long illness, aged 80 years.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 3rd, at Hyde Park Mansions, aged 63, **Spencer Vincent**, son of the Rev. W. W. Vincent, Rector of Rowde, Wilts. Was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was afterwards

called to the Bar of the Inner Temple, and made a reputation by his learned edition of "Jarman on Wills." In conjunction with Mr. Justice Chitty, he was the founder of the Volunteer movement in the Inns of Court. He was also an accomplished water-colour artist, and was one of the original founders of the Dudley Gallery Society. On the 8th, aged 50, at Old Commaught, Bray, Ireland, Lady Plunket, the wife of Rev. William Conyngham Plunket, fourth Lord Plunket and Archbishop of Dublin. She was only daughter of Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness, first baronet, and sister of Lord Ardilaun. On the same date, at Edinburgh, aged 58, James Muirhead, LL.D., Professor of Civil Law (1862), and succeeded Lord McLaren as Sheriff of Chancery. In 1886 he was appointed Sheriff of Stirling, Dumbarton, and Clackmannanshire. He was the editor of the "Institute of Gains" (1880). Also on the same date, aged 61, in the hunting field, William Henry Wakefield, of Sedgwick House, Kendal, D.L. and Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Westmoreland. The head of the banking firm of Wakefield, Crewdson & Co., he was also a large gunpowder manufacturer, and was a successful breeder of shorthorns. He married, 1851, Augusta, daughter of John Haggarty, U.S. Consul at Liverpool. On the 9th, suddenly, aged 55, Joseph Gordon, engineer to the London County Council. He designed plans for the draining of many large towns in the North of England and Scotland and on the Continent. On the same date, at Moore Park, co. Cork, aged 64, Stephen Moore, fourth Earl Mountcashell. Educated at Eton; entered the Rifle Brigade, but retired after a few years. He was never married. On the 13th, at Witham Close, Winchester, aged 87, the Very Rev. John Bramston, D.D., Dean of Winchester (1872-83). He was the second son of Thomas Gaidner Bramston, of Skreens, M.P. for Essex. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. Fellow of Exeter, 1825-30; Vicar of Great Baddow, 1830-40, and of Witham, 1840-72. Married, first, Clarissa, daughter of Sir Nicholas Trant, and secondly, Annie, daughter of Osgood Hanbury, of Holfield Grange, Essex. On the same date, at Tunbridge Wells, aged 80, Sir Samuel Morton Peto, Bart., the son of the late William Peto, of Cookham, Berkshire, and a civil engineer in partnership with Mr. Grissell and afterwards with Mr. Betts. He received his baronetcy for having gratuitously superintended the construction of a railway from Balaelava to Sebastopol in 1854, and other works. He married, first, in 1831, Mary, daughter of T. de la Garde Grissell, and second, in 1842, Sarah Ainsworth, daughter of Henry Kelsall, of Rochdale. On the 14th, at Carleton, aged 74, William Henry Leatham, of Hemsworth Hall, Pontefract, son of William Leatham, of Heath, near Wakefield. For some years a banker at Wakefield, Doncaster, and Pontefract. Sat as a Liberal for Wakefield, 1859, and from 1865-8, and for the South Division of the West Riding, 1880-5. Married, 1839, Priscilla, fourth daughter of Samuel Gurney, of West Ham, Essex. On the 15th, in Paris, aged 98, Colonel Ambrose Dudley Mann, one of the Confederate envoys to Europe in 1861. On the same date, at Oxford and Cambridge Mansions, aged 89, Robert Marnock, a landscape gardener, by whom the Botanical Society's Gardens in the Regent's Park were laid out. Also on the same date, at Hyères, aged 33, Hon. and Rev. Arnold de Grey, Rector of Copstock, second son of Thomas, fifth Lord Walsingham. Married, 1882, Margaret, daughter of Hon. Spencer Ponsonby-Pane. On the 16th, at Sydney, N.S.W., David Berry, an early settler in the colony of New South Wales. He bequeathed his immense fortune to different charitable endowments, including 100,000*l.* to the University of St. Andrews, where he had been educated. On the 18th, aged 59, Eugène Bersier, a popular Protestant pastor in Paris. On the same date, at Portmadoc, aged 71, Charles Easton Spooner, who greatly developed the system of narrow-gauge railways, of which the Festiniog Railway, designed by his father, was the pioneer. On the 20th, at Hartham Park, Corsham, Wilts, aged 22, John Alfred Wilson-Patten, Lieutenant 1st Life Guards, grandson and only heir to the barony of Winmarleigh, his father, Hon. Eustace J. Wilson-Patten, having died in 1873. On the 21st, at Castilla, Clontarf, near Dublin, aged 74, Sir John Valentine Bradstreet, fifth baronet. Married, 1836, Doña Josefa de Vinuesa, daughter of Don Xavier de Vinuesa, of Burgos, o.s.p. On the 23rd, aged 58, Lieutenant-Colonel William Thomas Kemmis Betty, of Knightstown, Queen's County, late of 6th Dragoon Guards. He had served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns and also in Oude. On the 24th, aged 82, Admiral Arthur William Jerningham, son of W. C. Jerningham, brother of eighth Baron Stafford. On the same date, aged 74, Right Hon. William Barnard, fifth Baron de Blaquiere, of Ardkill, co. Londonderry, Great Alnager of Ireland, younger son of William, third baron. Entered the navy in 1829, and retired as Captain, R.N., in 1873. Married, 1862, Anna Maria, only daughter of John Wormald, of Brockworth Manor, Glou-

cestershire, o.s.p. Also on the same date, at Brussels, aged 64, George H. Pendleton, late United States Minister at Berlin. Also on the same date, at Scarborough, aged 36, Commander Gerald Lycidas King-Harman, R.N., younger son of the Hon. Laurence H. King-Harman, of Rockingham and Newcastle, co. Longford. Also on the same date, at Oxford House, Great Marlow, aged 51, Frederic Clay, a favourite composer of light opera music. On the 25th, at Mount Ballan, near Chepstow, T. A. Walker, the contractor for the Manchester Ship Canal, and previously the constructor of several great public works. On the same date, at Laxton Hall, Northamptonshire, Right Hon. George Patrick Percy, seventh Baron Carbery, the eldest son of Percy Evans-Freke; succeeded to the title on the death of his uncle, 1845. Married, 1852, Harriet Maria Catherine, daughter of General Edward W. Shuldham, B.I.C.S., of Dunmanway. On the 26th, at Shrewsbury, aged 66, Colonel Richard John Edgell, Chief Constable of Shropshire, late of the Bengal Army. On the 27th, at Deesa, shot dead by a sowar of his regiment, Colonel Arthur Rowley Heyland, 1st Bombay Cavalry. He entered the army in 1858, and served in the Afghan war of 1879-80, and in the Burmese expedition. On the same date, at Ramsgate, aged 81, Henry James Wolfenden Johnstone, F.R.C.S., the son of the late Dr. Johnstone, Physician in Ordinary to King William IV. He had at one time a large practice, until his health compelled his retirement. He resided in France, 1848-50, and was the writer of letters to the *Times* by "An Englishman," anticipating the policy of Napoleon, which attracted much attention. On the 28th, at Kilcomney, co. Wicklow, aged 67, Matthew Peter D'Arcy, educated at Trinity College, Dublin. M.P. for Wexford, 1868-74. Married, first, 1853, Emma, daughter of William Knaresborough, R.M., and second, 1860, Christina, daughter of James Daly, of Castle Daly, co. Galway. On the same date, at Brussels, aged 75, Lady Susan Harriet Catherine Opdebeeck, daughter of Alexander, tenth Duke of Hamilton. Married, 1832, Henry, Earl of Lincoln, afterwards fifth Duke of Newcastle; dissolved 1850; and second, in 1860, M. Opdebeeck, of Brussels. Also on the same date, in Oxford Terrace, aged 68, General John Stafford Paton, C.B., late Quartermaster-General of Her Majesty's army in India, son of Captain J. F. Paton, of the Bengal Engineers.

DECEMBER.

Jefferson Davis was born in Kentucky on June 3, 1808, and had consequently completed his eighty-first year. While he was still a child the family removed to the State of Mississippi, with which he was ever afterwards closely connected. His early education was of the ordinary American type, and at the age of sixteen he went to the Military Academy at West Point, obtaining four years later a commission as second lieutenant. For the next seven years he seems to have been occupied with military duties, which consisted chiefly in keeping the Indians in check. In 1835 he married the daughter of General, afterwards President, Taylor, and settled down in Mississippi as a cotton planter upon the estate left him by his father. He appears to have led an uneventful life, relieved by a certain amount of local political activity, until 1845, when he was returned as one of the members for Mississippi to the House of Representatives. There he took part in debates upon the burning questions of the time—the state of the army, the tariff, and the joint occupation of Oregon. His speeches of that period are somewhat highflown, and contain much

indignant rhetoric concerning the aims of Southern men and the misconstructions placed upon them by those of the North. Upon the breaking out of the Mexican war he was chosen Colonel of the Mississippi Volunteers, whereupon he resigned his seat and joined the army of his father-in-law on the Rio Grande. He served with distinction at the battle of Buena Vista, assisted at the storming of Monterey, and was one of the commissioners appointed to arrange its capitulation. In recognition of his services, President Polk offered to make him Brigadier-General of Volunteers, but he showed his characteristic political bias by declining the honour on the ground that it was not in the gift of the Federal Government, but of the individual State.

In 1847 Davis was elected Senator for Mississippi, and continued with, if possible, increasing energy his advocacy of State rights against what he conceived to be the unjust and unconstitutional encroachment of the Federal Executive. In 1850 he became Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and in March, 1851 was re-elected Senator for Mississippi, a posi-

tion thus secured to him for six years. At that time the public mind was greatly agitated by the "compromise measures" of the previous year on the slavery question. The result was a proposition from the people of the different Southern States for a Convention of Delegates to consider what steps should be taken to preserve their constitutional rights and to insure future peace. Mr. Davis had taken so prominent a part in the Senate in discussing everything connected with the pending controversy that he thought himself bound to meet the people of Mississippi face to face and give an account of his stewardship. He accordingly made a tour through the State, expounding his views and defending his actions, which, however, do not seem to have ever been seriously challenged by his own constituents. His tour ended just at the time appointed for the meeting of the Democratic Nominating Convention of the State, and while the canvass for the State Legislature was going on simultaneously with that for the State Convention just named. The Convention election came off first, and the Democrats were beaten by more than 7,000 votes. Mr. Davis was then urged to become a candidate for the Governorship instead of General Quitman, who retired in view of the demonstrated weakness of the party. In order to do this he had to vacate his seat in the Senate; and though he failed to secure election, he had the satisfaction of reducing the majority from 7,000 to less than 1,000.

For some eighteen months Mr. Davis was free from the yoke of public cares, and devoted his time and attention to his plantation. In the end of 1852, however, he was asked to join the Cabinet of the President-elect, Mr. Pierce, who would come into office in the following March. Mr. Davis declined, but being again pressed, after the inauguration of the President, he became Secretary for War. Under his administration considerable activity was shown in surveying routes for railway communication between the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific coast, in increasing the efficiency of the army, and in carrying on experiments in gunnery. He also made some attempt to break through the pernicious system by which every Government post down to the humblest is made part of the plunder of the party attaining to power. During this presidency the contention between North and South gained in bitterness and even in ferocity. The attention of Congress was largely occupied by the affairs of Kansas, in which

disorder had attained the proportions of civil war. A committee of the House visited Kansas to verify by personal observation the accounts which reached Washington, and were rewarded with indubitable proof that armed invasions from Missouri were a constant feature of election days. Mr. Charles Sumner denounced in the Senate what he called the "crime against Kansas," and made uncomplimentary allusions to Butler, the Carolina Senator. Two days afterwards he was attacked while sitting at his desk in the Senate House with so much violence that his life was at first despaired of. Preston Brooks, the representative for South Carolina, was the principal assailant, and was expelled from the House of Representatives in consequence. His constituents immediately returned him, and in two weeks he again took the oath and his seat. He had the sympathy of the Southern leaders, including Mr. Jefferson Davis, who approved "the feeling which prompts the sons of Carolina to welcome the return of a brother who has been the subject of vilification, misrepresentation, and persecution, because he resented a libellous assault upon the representative of their mother."

At the close of Mr. Pierce's presidency in 1857, Mr. Davis was again chosen Senator for Mississippi, and immediately had ample opportunities for plunging into the great quarrel which had always attracted him. The constitutional battle was then raging around the organisation of Kansas, which was in process of settlement, and, therefore, well fitted to bring the dispute to a point; whether the American people ought at any rate not to tolerate the extension of slavery, or whether the migration of slaves into new territory did not constitute an extension of slavery, and, further, whether the Constitution required that the people of every district should be left free to say for themselves whether they would have slaves or not. This theory of popular rights was at last pushed to such an extent under the name of squatter sovereignty that it actually split the Democratic party itself. At this moment, under the administration of President Buchanan, America was organising herself into two hostile camps, calling themselves Democrats and Republicans—the one clinging to State rights, the other to Federal authority.

Two incidents during Buchanan's presidency added fuel to party passion—the "Dred Scott" case, in which the Supreme Court held that, according to

the Constitution, negroes could not be regarded as citizens; and the raid of John Brown into Virginia at the head of fourteen white men and five negroes. A collision at Harper's Ferry ensued, in which thirteen raiders were killed and the remainder hanged. At the Presidential election of 1860 Mr. Lincoln was elected by a majority of electoral votes, although not of the popular vote. He appointed Mr. Seward as the chief member of his Cabinet, a politician of uncompromising nature. On Dec. 20 the Convention of South Carolina adopted an ordinance withdrawing from the Union, and on the following day her representatives vacated their seats in Congress. On Jan. 9, 1861, Mississippi took a similar course, and before the end of the month Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana had seceded from the Union. On Feb. 9 Mr. Jefferson Davis was chosen to be President of the new Confederacy. So far all had gone peacefully, and few persons shared Mr. Davis's opinion that the North would not permit secession without war. The right to secede was admitted by the victorious party, and President Lincoln in his inaugural address deprecated anything in the nature of an armed invasion of the seceding States.

Mr. Davis's prophecy, however, was to be too fully justified. The occupancy of Fort Sumter had at first been treated by the Washington Government as a question to which it attached little importance. The Confederate representative at Washington was assured that it would be evacuated forthwith, but a change came over the views of the Federal Government, and an attempt was made by it to secretly reinforce the garrison of the fort. The Confederates were taken unawares, and decided at once to blow up the fort, and were thus technically responsible for striking the first blow in a civil war. The Washington Cabinet replied by calling out 75,000 men; and Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas joined the new Confederacy.

From this point the biography of Jefferson Davis is the history of the Civil War. In organising his administration he had the advantage of considerable experience in one of the highest posts in the United States Cabinet, and his special military knowledge doubtless proved exceedingly useful. But the task before him was Herculean. The Confederacy had everything to construct from the beginning. The army, the navy, the arsenals, the munitions of war, the manufacturing centres, and in

many cases even the raw material for necessary manufacture were with the North. Everything, even including a circulating medium, had to be created, as communication with the outside world was attended with risk and difficulty.

After four years of the most desperate efforts to shake off the Northern invaders, the Confederate defence was at last broken down, and the fall of Richmond, on April 5, 1865, put an end to the Government of Jefferson Davis. Accused by angry partisans of complicity in the plot to assassinate President Lincoln, a reward of \$100,000 was offered for his capture. This was effected about six weeks after his flight from Richmond, and he was carried to Fort Monroe, where he was jealously guarded pending a trial which never took place. The delay caused by the difficulty of deciding in what manner he should be tried probably saved his life by giving time for the dissipation of the absurd suspicion that he had stooped to plan a treacherous murder. In June of the following year an effort was made to procure his release, but although no resolution had been come to concerning his trial, Congress decided by a large majority that he should remain in prison. At length, after two years' confinement, he was set at liberty, but it was not until other two years had passed that all proceedings against him were formally abandoned. After the failure of his great enterprise he took no part in public life. He engineered a Texan railway to the Pacific, wrote a voluminous account of the rise and fall of the Confederate Government, and finally undertook the management of a life assurance company.

In 1886, when the Democrats were in power, he emerged from his retirement in spite of feeble health and for no reason apparent to the world. He made a sort of political progress through Alabama and Georgia, delivering historical speeches which the Northern press not inaptly described as the funeral orations of the Confederacy, and calling forth a considerable amount of popular enthusiasm. He returned to his home at Beauvoir, Mississippi, and late in the autumn was attacked by malaria, complicated by acute bronchitis. Early in November he was moved to New Orleans, where he died on the 6th, at the house of a friend, Mr. I. V. Payne. His long illness, from which recovery was almost, if not quite, hopeless, was marked by resignation and even buoyancy, and throughout he was nursed by his wife, to whom he was

devotedly attached. Throughout the South much sorrow was expressed at his death, and public manifestations were made in the principal towns.

John Cameron MacDonald, "a Glen-coe man" by descent, as he used himself to say, was born at Fort William, N.B., in June 1832. His father was factor or agent for Lord Abinger's estates in that district. Lord Abinger, when Sir James Scarlett, had been legal adviser to the *Times*, and Mr. MacDonald came to London before he had completed his twentieth year with an introduction which led to a connection, extending over nearly half a century, that has only been severed by his death. He was immediately attached to the reporting staff, and soon began to be employed also in descriptive work. The Andover Poor Law Inquiry, in which the late Mr. Walter took much interest, was reported by him in 1845, and in 1848 he wrote a series of letters from Ireland describing the results of the famine and the Young Ireland movement. By an accident, which he always lamented, he narrowly missed being present when Smith O'Brien was captured at Ballinacorney, though he reached the famous "cabbage-garden" a few hours after the arrest. It was not, however, till 1851 that a subject presented itself which Mr. MacDonald's gifts and tastes peculiarly fitted him to handle. His articles on the Great Exhibition of that year, describing its contents, its organisation, and its progress, largely contributed to the success of the undertaking, which at the outset appeared to be by no means assured. He thus became intimately acquainted with Sir Joseph Paxton, who afterwards appointed him executor to his will, a mark of confidence also bestowed upon him by Mr. William Penn, the marine engineer, with whom, as well as with Sir Joseph Whitworth, his turn for mechanics brought him into close relations. His articles in favour of the movement for re-establishing the Exhibition building at Sydenham were also noteworthy. Another subject to which he devoted much attention was the formation of the first camp at Chobham. He was the author of the description of the wonderful scene in the streets on the historic occasion of the Duke of Wellington's funeral. On the outbreak of the Crimean War he accompanied, as the representative of the *Times*, the Prince Consort on his visit to the Emperor and Empress of the French at Boulogne. When the sufferings of the

British army at the seat of war during the terrible winter of 1854-55 came to be known at home, a relief fund for the sick and wounded was raised through the agency of the *Times*, and Mr. MacDonald was intrusted with its distribution. In the discharge of this task, his thoughtful care and sound, practical judgment achieved a complete success, and won him the gratitude of thousands of our suffering soldiers.

On his return from the East the first period of Mr. MacDonald's life-long connection with the *Times* came to a close. He was almost at once appointed manager of the printing establishment of the paper, and thenceforward, abandoning the literary part of journalism, for which, nevertheless, he had great natural aptitude, he devoted himself to the improvement of the mechanical working of the business, not less in obedience to his own tastes than to the traditions of the office. It may be mentioned that, during the earlier portion of his journalistic career, Mr. MacDonald joined one of the Inns of Court, and resided for some years in the Temple, but he was never called to the Bar.

As manager of the printing establishment, Mr. MacDonald was personally identified with the inventions and improvements which were crowned with complete success when, after years of experimental efforts, the *Times* was printed by the "Walter Press." The process of printing from stereotype plates was brought to perfection about 1800, and Mr. MacDonald and his associates then turned to the next problem—that of printing from the stereotype plates on continuous rolls of paper. In 1862 this experiment was taken in hand with a resolute determination to succeed. A machine-shop was set up in the office, and, under the guidance of the inventive skill of Mr. Calverley, the chief engineer, the solution was soon reached in principle. The victory over endless difficulties in matters of detail was won by slow degrees; but in 1866 the first of the Walter presses was set to work, and, by the end of 1869 their adoption in this office was an accomplished fact. The success of the Walter press, attested by the purchase of machines of this type for many of the most successful newspapers in the provinces and on the Continent, was followed up by other improvements, for which Mr. MacDonald was always on the look-out, and which he was eager to try. In this respect, as in all others, his mind retained to the last its elasticity and vigour, and made the development of the mechanical ap-

pliances connected with the production of the paper a steady and continuous process.

On the retirement of Mr. Mowbray Morris, Mr. MacDonald became the manager of the *Times*, though his interest in the printing department never abated. His energy, his enterprise, his shrewd judgment, his vast powers of work, and his absolute devotion to the interests of the paper were here displayed in a field of which the public can have no knowledge. Mr. MacDonald never shrank from toil, or attempted to evade responsibility. The burden of the conduct of the *Times'* case before the Special Commission, of course, fell heavily on him, and he watched the proceedings throughout with close and keen attention. He showed signs of fatigue at the close of the sittings in July, but had returned from his usual holiday in Scotland, apparently in renewed health and excellent spirits, a few weeks before the resumption of the Commission, when he was struck down by an illness which speedily assumed an acute form. After eleven weeks the hopes which from time to time were entertained by his friends were finally dispelled, and he died, on the 10th, at his residence at Waddon, near Croydon, aged 67 years.

The Right Hon. Edward Pleydell-Bouverie.—Edward Pleydell-Bouverie was born in 1818, and was the second son of the third Earl of Radnor by his second wife, a daughter of the late Sir Henry Paulet St. John Mildmay. He was educated at Harrow and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1838. He entered public life very soon after leaving the University. From January to June, 1840, he was *precis* writer to Lord Palmerston. In 1842 he married the youngest daughter of the late General Balfour, of Balbirnie, Fifeshire. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1843, and in the following year he was returned to Parliament in the Liberal interest as member for Kilmarnock, which constituency he continued to represent until 1874, when he was an unsuccessful candidate. During his thirty years of Parliamentary life Mr. Bouverie was a prominent figure in the House of Commons. From July, 1850, to March, 1852, he was Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, and from April, 1853, to March, 1855, he was Chairman of Committees. In March, 1855, he was made Vice-President of the Board of Trade, and in August of the same year he

vacated this office and became President of the Poor Law Board, which position he held until 1858. In 1857 he was appointed one of the Committee of Council on Education. He was second Church Estates Commissioner from August, 1859, until Nov., 1865, and from the year 1869 he was one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England. In 1872, when John Evelyn Denison, who had filled the Speaker's chair with dignity for fifteen years, was about to retire to the House of Lords as Viscount Ossington, Mr. Bouverie's name was mentioned in connection with the vacant office, though, as is known, Mr. Brand, now Lord Hampden, who had long served as "Whip" to the Liberal party, was ultimately appointed. Mr. Bouverie, though a staunch Liberal, was a Liberal of the old Whig school, and as time went on had found himself less and less able to follow the developments of Mr. Gladstone's policy, and as a result he found himself towards the close of his parliamentary career not infrequently in collision with his chief. This was especially the case in the debate in 1872 on the appointment of Mr. Harvey to the Rectory of Ewelme, a charge reserved by statute to graduates of the University of Oxford. Mr. Harvey's claim as such being only an *ad eundem* degree at that University, and again, in the following year, in the debate on the Irish University Bill, when he spoke and voted against his leader's policy. After the defeat of the Liberal Ministry in 1873 Mr. Bouverie did not again enter Parliament. He contested Kilmarnock in the following year, but was unsuccessful. In the City, where he was already well known, he soon became as prominent as he had been in the House of Commons. In 1877 he became associated with the newly constituted Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, of which he soon afterwards was made chairman. Under his guidance the debts of many countries were readjusted in a more or less satisfactory manner, the most important of these settlements being that of the Turkish debt, which was confirmed by the Sultan's *Irâdê* of Jan., 1882, and shortly afterwards that of Spain. Mr. Bouverie was also a director of many great companies, among them being the Great Western Railway Company, and the Peninsular and Oriental Company. He had for some time been in failing health, and succumbed, on the 11th, at his London residence in Wilton Place.

Robert Browning was born in 1812,

at Camberwell. His father was a clerk highly placed in the house of Rothschild. He was a Dissenter, and for this reason his son's education did not proceed on the ordinary English lines. The training which Robert Browning received was more individual and his reading was wider than that of most young men. He had no pretensions to be reckoned a classical scholar. His poetic turn declared itself rather early, and in 1835 he had a poem, "Pauline," ready for the press; but his business-like father did not see any chance of returns from poetry. A kind aunt, however, came to the rescue, and presented the young poet with the cost of printing the little book, 80*l*. It was published at the price of a few shillings, and of course did not sell; but the author had the curious satisfaction of seeing a copy of this original edition bring twenty-five guineas under the hammer a year or two before his death. "Pauline" was not reprinted till the issue of the six-volume edition of Mr. Browning's works in 1869. It was followed by the more ambitious "Paracelsus," a striking attempt to fill a mediæval outline with a compact body of modern thought; but in spite of the lovely lyric "Over the sea our galleys went," and in spite of other beauties, the public did not heed the book.

Two years later the young poet came forward with the historical play of "Strafford," which, as we have said, was produced at Covent Garden with Macready in the title-part. It was not exactly a failure, but though the play itself and Macready's acting attracted the admiration of the critics, it was at once seen that the drama contained too much psychology and too little movement for a popular success. Mr. Browning, however, did not for a long time to come cease to be a "writer of plays," though it was not till eleven years later that another drama of his, "A Blot on the Scutcheon," was performed on the stage. The interval was full of poetic activity, although the place of the first publication of several scattered poems of about this date has only been recently ascertained. Four of them, including "Porphyria" and "Johannes Agricola," appeared in the *Monthly Repository*, edited by W. J. Fox, a Unitarian minister, and subsequently well known as the eloquent opponent of the Corn Laws and member of Parliament for Oldham. In 1840 came a small volume in grey paper boards, called "Sordello," after the Provençal poet mentioned in the "Purgatorio" of Dante. In 1863 "Sordello" appeared for the first time

with a dedicatory letter addressed to M. J. Milsand, of Dijon, a writer on philosophy. Between 1841 and 1846 a series of poems appeared under the quaint title of "Bells and Pomegranates"—eight thin yellow-covered pamphlets printed in double columns of small type by Mr. Moxon. In this series first appeared all Browning's plays, except "Strafford," beginning with "Pippa Passes" and ending with a "Soul's Tragedy." Alternating with these were many of the shorter poems which have long since passed into the treasure-house of English poetry. One of the numbers contained the set subsequently published under the title "Dramatic Lyrics," including "In a Gondola," "Warning," and "The Pied Piper of Hamelin." Another number contained "Dramatic Romances and Lyrics," among which are to be found such favourite poems as "How they brought the good news from Ghent to Aix," and "Saul." In this group of poems were also to be found the celebrated lines called "The lost leader." People at the time supposed that these indignant verses were aimed at the Tory backsliding of Wordsworth; and, indeed, though Mr. Browning in after years denied their special applicability to the old Laureate, there can be no doubt that when he wrote them he had Wordsworth more or less in his mind.

In 1846 Mr. Browning, on Sept. 12, in Marylebone parish church, married, under somewhat romantic circumstances, the poetess, Elizabeth Barrett, the daughter of a Herefordshire squire, R. Barrett Barrett, who had engaged Browning to read Greek with her. Their union was the direct result, in the first instance, of poetic and intellectual sympathy, and it was to the admiration which Miss Barrett, then an invalid, felt for the author of "Bells and Pomegranates" that they owed their first introduction. For the greater part of their married life Mr. and Mrs. Browning lived almost entirely in Italy, and especially at the Casa Guidi in Florence, close by the Porta Romana, which now bears a tablet with her name, and which gave its title to one of her best-known volumes of poetry. They had one child, born in 1849, Robert Barrett Browning, whose talents were shown as a painter and sculptor. After just fifteen years' marriage, Mrs. Browning died in 1861; the frail body almost literally burnt up by the fiery soul within. The closeness of their union was made evident to the world when he wrote the splendid invocation to his "Lyric Love" at the opening of the "Ring and the Book."

During the first years of married life Mr. Browning wrote little, but he read widely and deeply, and in 1849 he republished, in two reasonable-sized volumes, "Paracelsus" and "Bells and Pomegranates," under the title of "Poems, by Robert Browning." Next year followed his most definitely Christian poem, "Christmas Eve and Easter Day;" a small volume in which the mysteries of the Christian religion were handled in their relations with the modern world. Then, in 1852, followed a prose publication, which was, unfortunately, founded upon a mistake, and which was at once suppressed and not brought to light until the Browning Society reprinted it years afterwards. This was the celebrated introductory essay to a volume purporting to consist of letters from Shelley. The letters were soon discovered to be fabrications, but Mr. Browning's essay was merely a discussion on Shelley's place as a writer of poetry. In 1855 appeared two volumes entitled "Men and Women," which contained some of the most successful of all his productions; and for some time, probably on account of the critical state of his wife's health, Browning published nothing new until after her death. In 1864 appeared the volume called "Dramatis Personæ," which was followed in 1868 by the four volumes of "The Ring and the Book," which, taken together, raised their author to a unique position in contemporary literature, and in the opinion of many marked the height of his poetic achievements. Since the appearance of the latter work he attempted nothing of equal importance in scope or magnitude. But he left his admirers no room to complain of diminished fecundity or of decaying vigour. "Balaustion's Adventure, including a transcript from Euripides," appeared in 1871 to prove his undiminished insight and inexhaustible interest in spiritual analysis. It was followed by "Prince Hohenstiel-Schwangau, Saviour of Society," a book suggested by the collapse of the French Empire, and recalling the scathing satire with which he lashed the impostures of spiritualism in "Sludge the Medium." In 1872 he published "Fifine at the Fair," to the delight of those who loved him, and, as usual, to the irritation of those who did not. "Red Cotton Nightcap Country" appeared in the following year; and, after an interval of two years, was followed by "Aristophanes' Apology." Again, after a similar interval, he gave us "The Agamemnon of Æschylus Transcribed." In 1879

came "Dramatic Idylls," with the stirring ballad of "Hervé Riel," which, as some think, roused the Laureate to emulative effort. "Jocosenæ," published in 1883, reclaimed many of his earlier admirers who had been estranged by the obscurity and ruggedness of so many of his later works. "Perisbath's Fancies and Parleyings with Certain People of Importance in their Day" was the rather cumbrous title of a still later volume; and on the very eve of his death appeared "Asolando," a work which displayed all the old qualities, the old fire, and the old audacity, apparently untouched by advancing years or even by imminent death.

He was on a visit to his son at the Palazzo Rezzonico at Venice, which the latter had recently purchased and fitted up, when he was seized by an attack of pulmonary bronchitis, aggravated by asthma. For some days he struggled against the illness, and in fact those about him scarcely realised his danger. On the day before his death he was able to receive the telegrams announcing the favourable reception his new volume "Asolando" had met with from the public and the critics, and on the following day (Dec. 2) he passed away quite peacefully. His wish had been to be buried at Florence, by the side of his wife; but his son, yielding to a strongly expressed wish, allowed the body to be removed to England, where it found a fitting resting-place in the Poet's Corner of Westminster Abbey.

Sir William Dunbar, who died at Mochrum Park, Wigtownshire, on the 19th, aged 76, was the eldest son of James Dunbar, of the 21st Light Dragoons, by Anna Catherine, daughter of Baron de Reede, d'Outshoorn (Holland). He was educated at the Edinburgh University, and called to the Scottish Bar in 1835; sat as a Liberal for Wigtown Burgh, 1857-65, and was a Junior Lord of the Treasury, charged with Scotch business, in Lord Palmerston's last Administration, and Keeper of the Privy Seal of the Duchy of Cornwall. In view of approaching changes in the system of auditing the public accounts he was appointed in 1865 last Chairman of the Board of Audit—a post which in 1867 was transformed into Comptroller-General of the Exchequer and Auditor-General of Public Accounts. He held this office from its creation until May, 1888, and by his firmness and sagacity established complete parliamentary control and review of the public expenditure. He married, 1842, Catherine Hay,

eldest daughter of James Paterson, of Carpow, co. Perth; having succeeded, in 1841, his uncle as seventh baronet. In addition to his other distinctions, he held, as Steward of Scotland, the office of Keeper of the Great Seal to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales.

The Bishop of Durham, Joseph Barber Lightfoot, was born in 1828 at Liverpool; and was educated at King Edward's School, Birmingham, of which Dr. Price Lee, afterwards Bishop of Manchester, was then the headmaster. From his hands he passed to Trinity College, Cambridge, and obtained the highest honours in his degree. He was Senior Classic and Senior Chancellor's medallist in 1851, and was also a Wrangler, or a First Classman in mathematics. His subsequent life was for many years mainly devoted to the University, to which he was intensely attached. He became Fellow of Trinity in 1852, and subsequently tutor. In 1861 he became Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and in 1875 Margaret Professor. He combined with these University offices, indeed, various other important duties. He became chaplain to the late Prince Consort in 1861, chaplain to the Queen in 1862, and Deputy Clerk of the Closet in 1875, and examining chaplain to Dr. Tait, both as Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, from 1862-79. In 1871, moreover, he was appointed Canon Residentiary at St. Paul's Cathedral. The earliest of the great series of commentaries with which Dr. Lightfoot's name will be ever associated—that on the Epistle to the Galatians—was published in 1865, and the preface stated that “the present work is intended to form part of a complete edition of St. Paul's Epistles, which, if my plan is ever carried out, will be prefaced by a general introduction and arranged in chronological order.” This was followed in 1868 by a Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, and in 1875 by a Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon; and there this invaluable series came to a close. During this period Dr. Lightfoot exerted a very important influence in the movement which led to the preparation of the

Revised Version; and a volume which he published in 1871 “On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament,” though published after the Company of Revisers had met, exerted an important influence in encouraging that enterprise. But in 1879 he accepted, though not without some reluctance, the Bishopric of Durham, in succession to Dr. Farrer. It was a bold step to appoint the most learned scholar of the Church to a post which made the most arduous call on practical ability and energy; but the appointment was eminently justified by the result so far as the diocese of Durham was concerned. The Bishop never ceased his learned labours, and his grand work on the Ignatian Epistles was completed in 1885, amidst the discharge of his diocesan duties. He made Bishop Auckland a centre of learning and teaching for his clergy; but he devoted himself with unstinted energy to the practical work of his see, and soon became beloved and trusted throughout his diocese for the impulse and support which he gave to every good work. He threw himself into the work of the Church Temperance Society and the White Cross Army with an enthusiasm rarely combined with so much knowledge and solidity of judgment; but these were illustrations of his simple Christian devotedness of character. His munificence was understood to be unbounded, and one of his last acts was to build a church at Sunderland as a thank-offering for what everyone hoped was his recovery from illness in the previous year. Such masterly learning and wisdom, combined with such earnest and simple-minded devotion, have been rarely seen. He was a worthy successor, in his services to Christian truth, of his great predecessor, Bishop Butler, and he surpassed him, partly no doubt under the stimulus of different circumstances, in his practical labours. For nearly two years before his death his health had been giving way, and in 1888 it was thought that he could scarcely pass through the winter. During the summer he recovered so far as to raise the hopes of his friends, but with the cold weather his disease again triumphed, and he died on the 21st, at Bournemouth, at the comparatively early age of 61 years.

The following deaths also occurred during the same month:—On the 3rd, aged 67, at Victoria Station, Katherine Mary, married, 1848, Major-Gen. the Hon. Robert Bruce, formerly Governor of the Prince of Wales; died 1862. She was second daughter of Sir Michael Shaw Stewart; appointed Extra Bedchamber Woman-in-Ordinary to the Queen, 1848; to the Princess of Wales, 1863-5; and in 1866 Bedchamber Woman-in-Ordinary to the Queen. On the same date, at Writtle, Chelmsford, aged 69, the Hon. Henry William Petre, the son of the

eleventh Baron Petre. He lived many years in New Zealand, and was appointed in 1854 M.L.C. Married, first, 1843, Mary Anne, daughter of Richard Walmsley, of Middleton Hall, co. Essex, and second, 1886, Sara, daughter of Stephen J. Canfwell and widow of Julian Tolmé. On the 5th, at Boscombe Manor, Bourne-mouth, aged 70, Sir Percy Florence Shelley, third baronet, only surviving son of the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley, and of Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin. Born at Florence, 1819; educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A. 1841); succeeded his grandfather, 1844; and married, 1848, Jane, daughter of Thomas Gibson, and widow of Hon. Charles Robert St. John, c.s.p. On the 6th, at Maybury Heath, Woking, aged 67, General John Alfred Street, C.B., Colonel of 2nd Battalion Scottish Rifles. He had served with 90th Regiment in China in 1842 and throughout the Crimean campaign. On the same date, at Cork, aged 51, the Hon. Thomas Oliver Westenra Plunkett, divisional magistrate for Cork, and a prominent figure in recent Irish administration. He was the son of twelfth Baron Louth, and had served with distinction in the army during the Crimean war and in China. Also on the same date, aged 68, Jules Husson Fleury, a voluminous author who wrote under the name of Champfleury. On the 8th, at Islington, aged 80, Major Basil Gray, who in 1839, as lieutenant in charge of a half-company of 45th Regiment, defended the town of Newport against a large body of armed Chartists. On the 9th, in Dublin, aged 57, Major-General Alured Clarke Johnson, R.A., C.B. Entered the Royal Artillery in 1849, served in the Crimea, in the Indian Mutiny campaign, and commanded his corps in the march from Cabul to the relief of Candahar. On the 10th, aged 49, Ludwig Anzengruber, a popular Austrian poet, playwright, and novelist. On the 11th, at Tunbridge Wells, aged 90, Lady Charlotte Barbara Lyster, youngest daughter of seventh Earl of Shaftesbury and widow of Henry Lyster, of Rowton Castle, Shropshire. On the 12th, at Lenton, near Grantham, of which place he was Vicar, aged 61, the Rev. Edward Bradley, better known as "Cuthbert Bede," the name under which his "Verdant Green" and subsequent works were published. On the 14th, aged 71, Dr. Celestine Ganglbauer, Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna. On the same date, aged 61, Cornelis de Witt, formerly a French Deputy, and Under-Secretary for the Interior. Married the daughter of Guizot, and the author of several works on history and political economy. On the 15th, at Paris, aged 59, Marquis de Caux, the former husband of Madame Adelina Patti, at one time querry to Napoleon III. On the same date, at Brighton, aged 78, Sir Charles Farquhar Shand Knight, LL.D., formerly Chief Justice of the Mauritius. He had been Counsel to the Lords of the Treasury and to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests in Scotland, and was the son of the late Rev. James Shand, of Marykirk, Kincardineshire. On the 16th, at Madrid, aged 86, Fanny Llanos, the last surviving sister of the poet Keats. Señor Valentin Llanos, her husband, was in the diplomatic service of Spain, and an author of some repute. On the 19th, at Temple House, co. Sligo, aged 62, Captain James Wood Armstrong, R.N., of Chaffpool. Entered the Royal Navy in 1841, served in the Baltic during the Russian war, and was afterwards engaged in laying the Atlantic and Red Sea cables. On the 20th, aged 58, Sir Francis Fortescue Turville, K.C.M.G., of Husband's Bosworth Hall, Leicestershire, only surviving son of George Fortescue Turville. Was some time captain Oxford Militia and secretary to Lord Lisgar (Sir John Young) when Lord Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, in New South Wales, and in Canada. Married, 1878, Adelaide Annabella, daughter of Edward Taite Dalton, of Fennor, co. Meath, and widow of Lord Lisgar. On the 21st, aged 76, Ernest A. A. Havet, Professor of Latin Eloquence at the Collège de France, and of Literature at the Ecole Polytechnique. On the same date, in Bloomsbury Square, London, aged 49, Francis Albert Marshall, the author of numerous comedies and of some studies of Shakespeare. He was the son of the late William Marshall, of Patterdale Hall and Hallstead Hall, Westmoreland. On the 23rd, at Newquay, Cornwall, aged 68, Sir Paul William Molesworth; succeeded his brother as tenth baronet in 1862. Educated at Eton and St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A. 1843), took holy orders, and for some time was Rector of Tetcott, but became a Roman Catholic in 1854. Married, 1849, Jane Frances, daughter of Gordon W. F. Gregor, of Trewarthenick, Cornwall. On the same date, at Cannes, aged 80, Sir Joseph Heron, of Manchester, where he had been Town Clerk for fifty-one years; knighted in 1869. On the 24th, at Kensington, aged 65, Thomas Oldham Barlow, R.A., a celebrated mezzotint and "stipple" engraver. On the same date, at Earl's Court, Kensington, aged 75, Charles Mackay, LL.D., the author of several very popular songs. He had been connected with the *Daily News* and with the *Illustrated London News*, and during the Civil War in America he acted in New York as corre-

spondent of the *Times*. On the 25th, in Tedworth Square, Chelsea, aged 37, the Right Hon Arthur MacMurrough Kavanagh, of Berns House, co. Carlow, third but eldest surviving son of Thomas Kavanagh, of Borris House, by Lady Harriet Margaret, second daughter of second Earl of Clancarty. Married, 1855, Frances Mary, daughter of Rev. J. Forde Leathley; sat for co. Wexford, 1866-8, and for co. Carlow, 1868-80. He was almost wholly deprived of both legs and arms, but nevertheless he had been a great and adventurous traveller and an ardent sportsman, both in shooting and hunting. On the same date, at Theydon, Essex, aged 83, Right Hon. Raymond second Viscount Frankfort de Montmorency. Educated at Eton, and entered the army, serving in 10th Hussars. Married, 1835, Georgina Fredrica, daughter of Peter Fitzgibbon Henchy, Q.C. He was the only son of Right Hon. Lodge Evans-Morris, a prominent Irish politician from 1768 to 1800, when he was created a peer of Ireland and obtained Royal licence to adopt the surname of De Montmorency. On the 26th, aged 64, Count Aloys Karolyi, for many years Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in London; a member of one of the oldest and wealthiest of Hungarian families. On the 29th, at Lisbon, aged 67, a few days after her arrival, Her Majesty Theresa Christina Maria, daughter of Francis I., King of the Two Sicilies, and wife (1822) of Don Pedro II. d'Alcantara, ex-Emperor of Brazil. Her feeble health was much aggravated by the enforced voyage in mid-winter consequent upon the expulsion of the Royal family from Brazil. On the 30th, aged 69, Colonel Sir Henry Yule, B.E., C.B., K.C.S.I., a member of the Indian Council. The son of the late Major William Yule, of the Bengal Army, he had served in the campaigns of the Sutlej and Punjab, in Burmah, and in the Indian Mutiny campaign, and was subsequently attached to the Railway and Public Works Department. After his retirement from the service in 1862, he devoted himself to literature, and was the author of many standard works upon mediæval Indian, geographical, and other subjects. On the same date, aged 39, at St. Albans, where he was settled as a physician, William Oswald Livingstone, the last surviving son of the African traveller and missionary, Dr. Livingstone.

INDEX.

The figures between [] refer to PART I.

ACCIDENTS.—*Ajax*, 38-ton gun explosion, 43; Alton, Ontario, bursting of mill dam, 55; Antwerp, cartridge factory, explosion, 43; Asturia, colliery explosion, 1; Mt. Auburn, steam tramway, 50; Birchgrove Colliery, 18; Broughton Colliery, 12; Chartres, post-office, gas explosion, 8; St. Etienne, Verpilleux pit explosion, 81; Glasgow, weaving shed collapsed, 53; Hariford, Connecticut, boiler explosion, 8; Hyde Colliery explosion, 4; Johnstown, Penn., panic, 59; Little Lever, roof carried off, 7; Marseilles, collapse of house, 3; Quebec, fall of rock, 45; Staffordshire, North Chell Colliery explosion, 40; Mansfield Colliery explosion, 50; Sunderland, platform, 18; Tavistock, landslide, 1; Valencia Cathedral, petard explosion, 18

ADMIRALTY, orders to mobilise the fleet, 84

AERONAUTICS.—Antwerp, ascent from, 3; M^r. P. Spencer's ascent from Calcutta, 18; Borneville, Indiana, balloon burst, 20

AFGHANISTAN.—AMIR, insurrection [369]; Ishak, rebellion [368]

AFRICA, CENTRAL.—STANLEY's journey [420-424]; Emin Pasha [424], 53, 56, 59; Uganda revolution, 2

— **EAST.**—ABYSSINIA, Death of King John [414] MAKALOLOLAND, Serpa Pinto's expedition [417]; Col. Johnstone's despatch [417]; Menelek proclaims himself Negus [414]. ZANZIBAR, blockade of the Germans [415]; Bushiri's rebellion [415]; engagement with Capt. Wissmann [416], 50; hanged, 60; omissions to the Br. East African Co. 42; children born free, 50; Consular Court, Tippoo Tib, 62; German Mission House attacked, 3; Peters, Dr. C., expedition [415], 53

— **SOUTH.**—BECHUANALAND, question of British rule [410]. CAPE Colony, imports and exports [408]; Loch, Sir H., Gov. [408], 29; Parliament opened [408]; Robinson, Sir H., departure [126], [407]. MATABELELAND, envoys to England [409]; troubles with Boers [409]. NATAL, prosperity [408]; Mitchell, Sir C., Gov. [409], 40. ORANGE Free State, Conference of Delegates [411];

AFRICA, SOUTH, continued.

Treaty of Union, 12. SWAZILAND, Winton, Sir F. de, Special Commissioner [410]; Shepstone, Mr., dismissal [409]. TRANSVAAL, goldfields [412]; Revenue [413]; Delagoa Bay Railway [413], 29; Treaty of Union, 12. ZULULAND, Chiefs' trial [411]

— **WEST.**—CONGO, The, improvements [419]; Order of the African Star [419]. LAGOS, trade and revenue [418]; French treaty [418]. NIGER Company, complaint of the German Government [420]. SIERRA Leone attack on Jeornah [418]; French Commandant arrested [418]

AGRICULTURAL Society of England, Royal, Jubilee banquet, 14

ALBERT VICTOR, Prince, at Rangoon, 11; accidents at Poonah, 54

ALEXANDER of Battenberg, marriage, 6

AMERICA [425]. *Vide* Canada, United States, West Indies

— **CENTRAL** [440]; Nicaragua, scheme for a ship canal [441]; Panama Canal [440]; Central American confederacy [441]

— **SOUTH** [444]. **ARGENTINE Republic** [444]; Budget [444]. **BOLIVIA**, silver mines [448]. **BRAZIL**, Imperial Government collapse [444]; revolt [445]; Emperor fired at, 33; departure [447], 55; arrival at Lisbon, 59; general elections [448]; Rio de Janeiro, outbreak of yellow fever, 17; revolution [448], 55, 61. **BRITISH GUIANA** [449]; Demerara, rising of negroes [449], 13. **CHILE**, prosperity [448]; revenue [448]; Cabinet, resignation [448]. **ECUADOR**, Bolivar, Gen. S., statue unveiled [449]; Cabinet, new [449]. **PARAGUAY**, financial improvement [449]; imports and exports [449]. **PERU**, Grace-Donoughmore contract [449]; Lima, fires [450]. **URUGUAY**, progress [450]; plot discovered [450]. **VENEZUELA**, Presidential contest [450]; improvements [450]

ARNOLD Memorial Committee, 17

ART.—Retrospect of:

ART sales, 88

BRITISH Museum, 85

GROSVENOR Gallery, 88

NATIONAL Gallery, 84

NATIONAL Portrait Gallery, 85

New Gallery, 87

ART, Retrospect of, *continued*.
 ROYAL Academy, 87
 SOUTH Kensington Museum, 86
 ART galleries and museums, benefactions to, 63
 ARTILLERY Company, Royal, reconstituted, 18
 ARTISTS' Volunteers, new head-quarters, 14
 D'ARMALE, Duc, banishment annulled, 11; reception at Paris, 12
 AUSTRALASIA [461]. *Vide* New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, New Zealand, New Guinea, Fiji, Polynesia
 AUSTRALIA, SOUTH.—Robinson, Sir W., left for Melbourne [468]; Kintore, Earl of, Gov. [468]; Pallament opened [468]; Drought [469]; Mr. Dillon at Adelaide [469]
 — WESTERN.—Constitution bill [470]; revenue [471]
 AUSTRIA—HUNGARY. — ARCHDUKE JOHN, assumes the name of John Orth, 51; Army Bill [816]. BUDA-PEST, disturbances in, 5, 18. CABINET, reconstruction, [816]; Cracow, Archbp., created Prince [816]; Czechs, "old" and "young" [318]. EMPEROR opened the Delegation, 29; visit to Berlin [819], 89; attended request service, 58; speech on Foreign Affairs [817]. GALICIA, famine in [816]; Grosse Beeskerek, poisoning cases, 56. KALNOKY, Ct., address [818]. RUDOLPH, Crown Prince, suicide [818], 5; funeral, 6. STATE Railway, introduction of one tariff [817]; Strossmayer, Bp., 49. VIENNA, Natural History Museum, the new, opened, 89; riots [815]; Zone system, 37
 AUSTRIAN Government, corps of observation on the Servian frontier, 12
 BALFOUR, Mr. A. J., entertained by the Unionists of Scotland, 59
 BANK of England, rate of discount reduced, 2, 5, 18; raised, 39, 42, 46, 62
 BANNOCKBURN, Battle of, 555th anniversary, 29
 BARNUM's show partially wrecked, 21; arrival at Milford, 51
 BEATRICE, Princess, birth of son, 23
 BELGIUM.—BEERNAERT, M., charges against [841]; Brussels, Anti-Slavery Conference, 55; By-elections [842]. ELECTORAL law, revision [842]. MILITARY question [842]. STRIKES [840], [843]
 BERRSFORD HOPE v. Lady Sandhurst, 22
 BESANT v. Hoskyns, trial, 55
 BETHLEHEM, Sultan's Irade sanctioning a Protestant chapel, 55
 BILLIARD match between Messrs. Cook and Roberts, 11
 BIRMINGHAM, conference of Liberal Unionists and Conservatives [89], 54
 — Central, contest in [81-88]
 "FLAKE" cruiser launched, 57
 BOSPHORUS, illuminations in honour of German Emperor and Empress, 53
 BOULANGER, Gen., at Tours, 18; left Paris, prosecuted, 16; bill authorising the senate to try him, 17; in London, 19;

charges published, 34; guilty of conspiracy, 39; election annulled, 46, 59; at Jersey, 48
 BRASSY, Lord, award to lightermen, 46
 BRIGHT, J., death [79]; tribute to his memory [80]; funeral, 15
 BRISTOWE, Mr. S. B., shot at, 56
 BRITISH Association, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 44
 BRITISH South Africa Co. [204], 52
 BRODIE, Steve, went over the Niagara Falls, 44
 BROWNING, Mr. R., death, body deposited in Venice cemetery, 60; conveyed to England, 68
 BRUNO, Giordano, statue unveiled, 26
 BULGARIA.—FERDINAND, Prince, left Sofia, 49; return, 53; and the Bishops [880]; at Vienna and Paris [881]
 BURGESSES, Ancient Court of, superseded, 61
 BURMA.—DACOTY, decrease [870]; Hlutdaw, dissolution [871]; Karenni, expedition [870]; Tonghoo Mandalay Railway opened [871]; Ruby Mining Co., 10
 BURTON, footbridge over the Trent, 16
 CALAIS, new Maritime Railway Station, opened, 50
 CAMBRIDGE, Duchess of, death, 16; funeral, 17
 CANADA.—BUDGET [489]; Commence [489]; Gov.-General's tour [489]; Pacific Railway [489]
 CARDIFF, shower of red rain, 28
 CARDINALATE, elections to the, 18
 CARNOT, Pres., fled at, 21; opened the new Harbour at Calais, inaugurated the "Digue Carnot" at Boulogne, 25
 — the organiser of victory, remains removed from Magdeburg, 88
 CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. and Mrs., welcome to Birmingham, 2
 CHAPLIN, Mr H., first Minister of Agriculture, 43
 CHENONCEAUX Château sold, 5
 CHESS Congress, New York, 23
 CHETWYND, Sir G., resignation, 82
 CHETWYND v. Durham, 27; award, 80
 CHINA.—BUN LAN, King of Annam [892]. CHINKIANG, riot in [891], 6. EMPEROR's marriage [891], 9. FAMINE [889]; floods [889]; Formosa, fighting in [898]. HART, Sir R., 8; Hong-Kong, prosperity [893]. MINES [388]. RAILWAYS [889], 46. TONQUIN, affairs in [892]; trade [887]. YANGTZE, Upper, ascent [891]
 "CITY OF PARIS," quick passage to New York, 21; from, 63; Roche's Point, 23
 COLSTON annual banquet, Bristol, 55
 CONSTITUTION Hill, roadway thrown open, 52
 COREA.—Mr. Denny on [402]; Famine [402]
 COTTON "Corner," the, collapse, 47
 COUNTY Councils, London, election, 8; first meeting, 4; second, 7; election of aldermen, 6; transfer of the Metropolitan Police, 17; chairman re-elected, 54

CREMATION.—Ely, Marq. of, 18; Gagneur, M., 89; Col. G. Tomline, 42
 CRETE.—AMNESTY offered by Sultan, 57;
 Chalik Pasha Gov., 89; engagements with Turkish troops, 40; Greek Circular [827]; insurrection [202], [826], 85; Reserve called out, 37
 CRICKET.—Eton and Harrow, 80; inter-University match, 88, relative position of the counties at close, 42
 CRIMINAL CASES.—ALLEN, T., executed at Swansea, 17
 CLARKE, Lyster, and Burdell, penal servitude for life, 11; Colls, W., guilty, 51; Corvilain and Delanney imprisoned, 57
 DUKES, Wm., executed, 61
 HANDFORD, shot his wife and mother-in-law, 37
 LAURIE, J., murder of E. Ross, 54
 MAN and woman stabbed, 80; Martin, Insp., various sentences against his murderers, 52; Maybrick, Mrs. F., penal servitude [176], 38
 PARTON, C., sentenced to death, 18; Perrin, J., sentenced, 24
 THREE men executed at Leeds, 63
 CYCLONES.—Alabama, Georgia and Virginia, 8; Boston and Chicago, 21; English Channel, 26; Pennsylvania, 2; Williamsport (Penn.), 21
 DAMIEN, Father Joseph, death, 17; meeting for memorial, 28
 DANUBE, Lower, "Iron Gate" removed, 48
 DAVIS, Mr. J., funeral, 59
 DENMARK.—BUDGET [859]; Copenhagen, conference of delegates [860]; Horup, Mr., guilty of libel [861]; recess [869]; Rigsdag [866]
 DESMOULINS, C., statue unveiled, 82
 DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU, confiscation rescinded, 7
 DILLON, Mr. J., left for Australia, 10
 DIVORCE Court, cases since 1887, 16
 DOGS muzzled, order for, 40
 DOLGOROUKOFF, Prince, obliged to quit Sofia, 49
 DÖLLINGER, Dr., congratulatory addresses on his 90th birthday, 10
 DONSETT Volunteer Artillery, refusal to attend inspection, 44
 DRAMA.—Comic opera, 98; French Dramatic Art, 98; Plays, new, 90; revivals of Shakespeare, 92; Dresden, 800th Anniversary of the Wettin dynasty, 27
 DUEL, Goodloe and Swope, 54
 DUFFERIN, Marq. of, freedom of the City of London, 24
 DWYER, attempt to rob the Bank and suicide, 51
 EARTHQUAKES.—Alabama, 14; Brest, 26; English Channel, 24; Kumamoto, 37; Lancashire, 7; Lesbos, 52; New Bedford, Mass., 26; San Francisco, 37; Sicily, 62; Smyrna, 18; Sparta, 3; Yokohama and Tokio, 8

ECCLIASTICAL.—
 Church Congress, Cardiff [189], 47;
 Church Missionary Society, Fawceter Hall, 20; Corfe, Dr. C. J., missionary Bp. of Corea, 53
 EDWARDS, Rev. A. G., Bp. of St. Asaph, 8
 KING, Dr., Bp. of Lincoln, trial, 7
 LEIGH, Rev. A., Provost of King's College, Cambridge, 7
 ST. PAUL's Benedic. judgment, 25; Pullen, Rev. J., Suffragan Bp. of Richmond, 18
 RANDALL, Archdeacon, Suffragan Bp. of Reading, 32; consecrated, 68; Read v. Bp. of Lincoln, judgment, 22
 SMITH, Canon W. S., Bp. of Sydney, 89
 WARE, Rev. Canon, Suffragan Bp. of Derby, 32; consecrated, 53
 EGYPT.—DERVISHES, engagements with, [403], 12, 81, 38. FINANCE [405]; France, jealousy of [404]; French policy [407]. PUBLIC WORKS [404]; RAILWAYS [408]. SLAVE Trade, decrease [403]. ZIMMERMANN, M., resignation [404]
 EIGHTY Club entertainment, 11
 ELECTIONS, municipal, results, 58
 ELECTORS, Parliamentary returns, 80
 EMERSON, R. W., grave broken into, 49
 ERCKMANN and Chatrain, partnership ended, 43
 FERON, R., shot his sweetheart and himself, 18
 FERRY, first free, on the Thames, 14
 FIFE, Earl of, created Duke, 88; marriage, 86
 FIJL.—LEVUKA, fire [474]; population [474]
 FIRES.—ARBUTHNOT, Church, 6
 BIARRITZ, British Club, 18
 BOSTON, Mass., 57
 BROOKLYN, 17; Cathedral, 27
 BUDA-PESTH, Theatre, 61
 BURNLEY, Theatre Royal, 28
 CELLIER, Embrun, 9
 CHARTERHOUSE Square, 62
 CHATHAM Dockyard, 14
 CHESTER, Gen. Post Office, 3
 CLOUDS, East Knoyle, 2
 CHIPPLEGATE, City Soap Works, 21
 DEPTFORD, Foreign Cattle Market, 3
 ELLENSBURG, Washington, 31
 HALIFAX Cathedral, 14
 HAMMER Church, 6
 LAMBETH, 7
 ST. LAWRENCE, Quebec, 22
 LEVENBANK, Glasgow, 7
 LINESE, 14
 LOOCHOW, China, 28, 29
 LOUVAIN, Convent, 42
 LYNN, Mass., 57
 MADRID, N. Ry. Station, 48
 MANCHESTER, Royal Circus, 9
 METROPOLITAN Meat Market, 2
 MILLWALL, 52
 MINNEAPOLIS, 58
 MOREHEAD, Chicago, 21
 NEW KENT Road, 4
 NEW YORK, 19
 OREGON, forest, 45
 OSTROG, Volynia,

FIRE, *continued*.

- ST. PAUL'S, Minnesota; 40
 PEKING, China, 4
 PENICUK, Mauricewood Pit, 48
 PRILICO, Baltic Wharf, 15
 QUEEN Victoria Street, 59
 REFORMATORY ship "Cumberland," 8
 ROCHESTER Fever Hospital, 58
 SACHSENBURG, Waldeck, 59
 SAN SALVADOR, Palace, 56
 SEATTLE, Washington, 26
 SOUTHWARK, 82
 STALYERIDGE, Victoria Theatre, 52
 STRATFORD Saw Mills, 82
 SURAT, 17
 SURREY Commercial Docks, 32
 WEEDON, Military Stores, 10
 WOOD Street, Cheapside, 46
- FLOODS**.—ALLEGHANIES, U.S., Virginia and Pennsylvania, 25; England, 11; Midlands, 24; Shantung, Yellow River, 86; United Kingdom, 40
- FRANCE**.—ANTOINE, M., resumed his nationality, 18; Army Bill passed, 82; Atchinnoff Expedition [275]; d'Aumale, Duc, return [276]. BOULANGER, Dillon, and Rochefort guilty of conspiracy [288], 89; Budget [279], [282], [286]; By-elections [270]. CARMEN'S Strike [280]; Centenary Fêtes [278]; Chamber of Deputies, Ministry resigned, 8; Charente and Somme, Boulangist candidates returned, 2; Comptoir d'Escompte, suspends payment [276]; Councils-General Elections, 87. EGYPTIAN Debt, 29; Elections, General [284], 45, 48. LAUR, M., monopoly in copper, 18; "L'Officier Bleu," performance prohibited, 4. MEILLAC, M., 16; Méline, M., Pres. [271]. PARIS, American Banquet, 22, 27; Becker, compromising letters seized, 26; Boulanger, Gen., elected, 5; flight, [277]; Denfert-Rochereau, M., suicide, 10; Dillon, election annulled, 57; Exhibition formally opened, 21; closed, 58; Floquet, M., Pres., 55; Hérisse, M. Le, expelled, 88; Laguerre, M., 82; Ministry, defeat, 56; Municipal Council banquet, 40; Patriots' League [275]; Republic Fête, 88; Rouvier, M., promised advances, 11, 12; Secrétan, sale of pictures, 81, 87; Seine, sudden rise, 9; Tirard, M., Cabinet, 9; Tribunal of Commerce, judgment, 47. REVISION Bill [274]; Royer, M. Le., re-elected [271]. SÉNART, Col., address to his soldiers, 6; session, close [282]

- GALES, England and Ireland, 6, 48, 57
 GAMBLING resorts entered by police, 22; members fined, 48
 GERMAN Emperor at Prince Bismark's Parliamentary dinner, 14; in the Downs, 37; visit to England [176], [811]; at Aldershot, 88; return to Germany, 39; at Frankfurt, 59; Kiel, 48; Monza, 50—and Empress, at Bayreuth, 40; Constantinople, 68; Hanover, 44; Strasbourg, 41; Venice, 54
 GERMANY.—ANTAGONISM with Russia [811]; army and navy estimates

GERMANY, *continued*.

- [800]. BERLIN, Fred. Leopold of Prussia, marriage, 29; Geffcken, Dr., trial [295], 1, 8, 7; Moltke, Crown of the Badge of Honour, 58; Official Gazette, letter rebuking the *Kreuz Zeitung*, 47; Reichstag opened, 51; Samoan Conference [805], [806], 27. Bismaick, Prince, on the East African Bill [801]. COLONIAL policy [801]. EMPEROR, visit to England [811]; Eudes, Dr. [808]; English settlements in Africa, difficulties with [805]. FEDERAL Council [310]; Friedberg, Dr., resignation [296], 8. HUMBERT, King, visit to the Emperor [808]. IMPERIAL Budget [800]. KNAPPE, Dr., removed from Samoa [805]. LANDTAG opened, 8. SETTLEMENT Treaty of 1870, terminated [811]; strikes [801]; WISMANN, Capt., Imp. Commissioner [803]; attack on Bushiri [804], 21; Wohlge-muth, expulsion [809], 20; Workmen's Insurance Bill [297-800]
- GLADSTONE, Sir T., funeral, 15
 — Mr., gift from the Ursuline Nuns, 18; at Paris, 44; deputation from Hyde, 46; celebrates his 80th year, 62; golden wedding [168], 86
 — Mrs., diamond bracelet, 28
 GLASGOW University, demonstration, 56
 GORDON, Mr., at Bury, murdered, 46
 GREECE.—ATHENS, departure of Royal guests, 52; Sparta, Duke of, marriage, [880], 52
 GRESHAM, Lehman, and Holland, row from Oxford to Putney, 42
 GRESHAM College, University extension, 46
 GUARDS' Memorial in Brompton Cemetery unveiled, 57
 GUINNESS, Sir E., gift for dwellings for the poor, 56
- HAILSTORM, Pohrlitz, Moravia, 41
 HAMBURG, murder of a boy, 17
 HAVELLOCK, Sir A., Gov. of Ceylon, 40
 HAWAII, revolution, 37
 HAWARDEN Estate effectments, 8
 HIGHLAND games at Paris, 50
 HOLLAND, the King of, illness, action of the Government, 20
 HOLLY, bearded, scarcity of, 62
 HOME Secretary, circular letter to magistrates, 4
 HOSPITAL for Women, Euston Road, foundation stone laid, 21
 — Convalescent Home, gift by anonymous benefactor, 68
 HUNT, Capt. W. C., shot himself and an actress, 17
 HUNTINGDON, Mr., subscription to the cost of the Congo Railway, 28
 HURRICANE, Dakota, 16; the Samoan group, 12
- IMPERIAL Federation League, meeting at Mansion House, 55
 INDIA.—ACTS and Bills [886]; army, [877]. BUDGET [879]. CHOLERA [876]; Congress [877]; cotton-spin-

INDIA, *continued*.

ning [388]. EXCHANGE [378-382]; excise [378]. FINANCE [379]. HART, Mr., mission [372]; Hyderabad, Duke and Duchess of Connaught [372]. INCOME tax [380]. KASHMIR, Maharajah, treasonable letters [374]. OPIUM cultivation [382]. Post Office Savings Banks [378]; Punjab, native troops reorganised [374]. RAILWAYS [375]; [381], [382], revenue [379]; Rohatk riots, 44; rupee currency [378]. SALR duty raised [380], [383]; season [376]; Sikkim question [372]. THIBET, negotiations with [372].

INDIAN National Congress at Bombay, 62

INFLUENZA at Berlin, Vienna, and London, 59; Russia, Siberia, 58; throughout Europe, 61; Paris, 62

INNSBRUCK, meeting of the Austrian and German Emperors, 55

IRELAND.—FATHER Byrne and Lient. Geohagan [266]. GREAT Northern Railway boycotted, 54; Gweedore prisoners, trial [268]. HARRINGTON, Mr. E., arrested [265]. LAMBERT, Bishop of, interdict, 28. MAGUIRE, Dr., death [266]; Martin, District Insp., killed, 6; Morris, Sir M., Law Lord, 57. O'BRIEN, Mr. W., arrested [265], 80, 41; released [268]; at Clonmel and Manchester, 5, 32; trial, 84, 61; Olphert Estate, eviction question [266]. PLUNKETT, Capt., death [268]. THURLES, Tenants' Real Defence Association, meeting, 52. WEST Donegal, evictions, 1. ZETLAND, Earl of, Viceroy [267], 24, 60

IRISH Peers, meeting of, 28

IRVING, Mr., and Miss Ellen Terry at Sandringham, 19

ITALY.—AGRICULTURAL crisis [290]. BUDGET [291]. CABINET, new [288]; Contadini, riots [290]; Crispi, Sig., foreign policy [287]. IMBRIANI, Sig., deputy [289]. KING, visit to Berlin, 23; departure, 24; treaty with Abyssinia, 48; opened Parliament, 57. MATTEI, Gen., arrest [287]; Menelek's mission [292]; Milan, Visti, G. G., tomb opened, 20; municipal elections [293]. PARLIAMENTARY recess [292], 38; Pope, the secret consistory, 62. ROME, old Protestant cemetery ceded to the Municipality, 3; disturbances in, 7; San Carlo Church, bomb thrown in, 15; and into a crowd, 40. "SOCIETÀ Dante Alighieri" established [289]. TARIFF war [294]; Tiberini Bank collapse [292]; Treaty of Commerce with Switzerland [287]

JAPAN.—ARMY [400]; assassinations [397], 51. EARTHQUAKE [400]. FINANCE [396]. IMPERIAL Diet [395]. MINISTRY, changes in [401]. New Constitution [394]. RELIGION [401]; revenue [398]. STORMS and floods [399]. TRADE and commerce [399]; treaty revision [397]

JERSEY, Earl of, Paymaster-Gen., 61

JOACHIM, Dr., fiftieth anniversary, 10; presented with a "red" Stradivarius violin, 18

KENT, mildness of season, 56
KIEL, bribery discovered, 36

LAIDLIER, Mr., nationalisation of the land, [222]

LAWN Tennis Championship, final match, 82

LIBERAL Conference, Manchester [245]

LINCOLN, Mr. R., U.S. Minister to England, 15

LITERATURE, retrospect of. Works of the season, principal:—

ADAMS, Mr. D., "The White King," 65. Arey, Mr. O., "The English Restoration and Louis XIV.," 65. Aitken, Mr., "The Life of Richard Steele," 77. Alexander, Mr. S., "Moral Order and Progress: an Analysis of Ethical Conceptions," 78. Alstine, Mrs. R. K. van, "Charlotte Corday," 76. Arnold, Mr., "Essays in Criticism," 79. Ashe, Mr. R. P., "Two Kings of Uganda," 82. Austin, Mr. A., "Love's Widowhood, and other Poems," 81

BABBAGE, Gen., "Babbage's Calculating Engines," 79. Badminton Library, "Driving, Fencing, Boxing and Wrestling," 82. Bain, Mr., "Christina, Queen of Sweden," 67. "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War," 69. Blind, Miss M., "The Ascent of Man, and other Poems," 81. Blunt, Mr. W., "In Vinculis" 81. Bodger, Mrs., "Myths, Scenes, and Worthies of Somerset," 69. Brassey, Lady, "The Last Voyage to India and Australia in the 'Sunbeam,'" 82. Broadfoot, Maj. W., "The Career of Major George Broadfoot, C.B., in Afghanistan and the Punjab," 74. Browning, Mr., "Asolando," 81. Bryce, Mr., "The American Commonwealth," 71. Butler, Sir W., "Charles George Gordon," 70. Bryant, Mrs., "Celtic Ireland," 70. CHAILLU, Mr. Du, "The Viking Age," 70. Church, Prof., "Henry the Fifth," 71. Clayden, Mr., "Rogers and his Contemporaries," 74. Cleveland, Duchess of, "The Battle Abbey Roll, with some account of the Norman Lineages," 64. "Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley," 73. Curzon, Mr. G., "Russia in Central Asia," 83

DINELEY, T., "The Official Progress of the First Duke of Beaufort through Wales in 1684," 65. Dunlop, Mr. R., "Grattan," 71

FERGUSON, Col., "Major Fraser's Manuscript," 68

GAIRDNER, Mr. J., "Henry VII.," 70. Gardiner, Prof., "History of the Great Civil War," 64. Gasquet, Mr. F. A., "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," 64. Gosse, Mr., "A History of Eighteenth Century Literature," 79. Graves, Mr., "Life of Sir William Rowan Hamilton, Royal Astronomer of Ireland," 75

LITERATURE, *continued.*

HILL, Dr. B., "Letters of David Hume to William Strahan," 78. "History of the Ancient Town and Manor of Basingstoke," 69. Holmes, Mr. T., "Four Famous Soldiers," 74. Hooper, Mr. G., "Wellington," 70. Howitt, Miss, "Mary Howitt; an Autobiography," 76.

INDERWICK, Mr., "Side Lights on the Stuarts," 65.

JEAFFERSON, Mr. J. C., "The Queen of Naples, and Lord Nelson," 67. Jessop, Dr., "The Coming of the Friars and other Historic Essays," 78.

KEBBEL, Mr. J. E., "Earl of Derby," 71. Knight, Dr., "The Life of William Wordsworth," 75. Koelle, Dr., "Mohammed and Mohammedanism," 66.

"LETTERS from Wales," 65. Lilly, Dr. W. S., "A Century of Revolution," 68. Linton, W. J., "Poems and Translations," 81. "Lives of the Fathers," 77. Lodge, Dr., "Modern Views of Electricity," 79. Logan, Lady, "Sir John Logan and Duleep Singh," 74. Luckock, Canon H. M., "The Divine Liturgy," 78.

MACGIBBON, Mr. De, "The Architecture of Provence and the Riviera," 80. Maine, Sir Henry, "International Law," 72. Malden, Mrs. C., "Jane Austen," 71. Malleson, Col., "Wellesley," 71. Mallock, Mr., "In an Enchanted Island," 82. Markham, Mr. C., "Life of John Davis the Navigator, 1550-1605," 71. Marshall, Mrs. J., "The Life and Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley," 76. "The Memoirs of Francis Thomas McDougall, D.C.L., F.R.C.S., sometime Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak, and of Harriette, his Wife," 77. Mart, Dr. St. G., "On Truth; a Systematic Inquiry," 79. Morley, Mr. J., "Walpole," 70. Morris, Miss, "The Diary and Letters of Gouverneur Morris," 67.

NETTLESHIP, Mr. H., "Essays by the late Mark Pattison," 79. Nicol, Mr. D., "The Political Life of our Time," 72. Norton, Mr., "Letters of Thomas Carlyle, 1826-1836," 74.

O'BRIEN, Mr. B., "Thomas Drummond," 73. O'Rourke, Archdeacon, "The History of Sligo Town and County," 69. Owen, Mr. J. A., "Woodland, Moor, and Stream," 82. "Oxford House Papers," 78.

PATER, Mr., "Appreciations; with an Essay on Style," 80. Porter, Maj.-Gen., "History of the Corps of Royal Engineers," 68. Probert, Mr. J. L., "A History of Miniature Art, with Notes on Collectors and Collections," 80.

RAWLINSON, Prof., "History of Phœnicia," 65. "A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays," 78. Ritchie, Mr. D. G., "Early Letters of Jane Welsh Carlyle," 74. Robinson, Mr. S., "Bench and Bar," 75. Ross, Mrs., "The Land of Manfred," 82.

SALT, Mr. H. S., "The Life of James Thomson ('B.V.') with a Selection

LITERATURE, *continued.*

from his Letters, and a Study of his Writings," 76. Sanders, Mr. L., "Lord Melbourne's Papers," 72. Seton-Karr, Mr. W. H., "Ten Years' Wild Sports in Foreign Lands," 82. Shallow, Mr. J., "The Templar's Trials," 68. Simpson, Mrs., "Reminiscences of a Regicide," 67. Starcke, Mr., "The Primitive Family in its Origin and Development," 78. Stephen, Mr. L., "Dictionary of National Biography," 71. Swinburne, Mr., "Poems and Ballads," 81.

TENNYSON, Lord, "Demeter, and other Poems," 80. Theal, Mr. G. M., "History of South Africa," 66. Timmins, Mr., "History of Warwick," 69. Traill, Mr. H. D., "Lord Strafford," 71. Trotter, Capt., "Lord Dalhousie," 71.

WALPOLE, Mr. S., "Life of Lord John Russell," 72. Werner, Mr. J. E., "A Visit to Stanley's Rear-Guard, with an account of River Life on the Congo," 82. "William George Ward and the Oxford Movement," 77. Woods, Mrs., "Lyrics and Ballads," 81. "Wordsworthiana," 75.

YONGE, Miss C., "Prince Consort," 71. ZIMMERN, Miss H., "Hansa Towns," 66.

LONDON School Board, Budget, 6; reassembled, 49; loan, 56.

LONDONDERRY, Maj. G., resigned, 42.

LONSDALE, Lord, and party reached Kodiak Island, 8.

LORD Chamberlain, order authorising high dresses, 6.

LORD Mayor (Whitehead), baronetcy conferred, 53.

LORD Mayor's State visit to Paris, 22.

MANHATTAN, island of, letter of purchase discovered at the Hague, 83.

MANSFIELD College opened, 49.

MANSION House, meeting to consider M. Pasteur's services, 30.

ST. MARY Woolnoth, and two other churches, unsanitary condition, 46.

MAYORALTY of London, 700th anniversary, 54.

MEETINGS—In Hyde Park, 7, 85; London tradesmen, 55; political, at Glasgow, 7; Portsmouth, 8; Socialist, attempted, 10; the "Unemployed" before Royal Exchange, 2; Women's Liberal Federation [117].

METROPOLITAN Board of Works, powers transferred to the County Councils, 13.

MINERS, Conference at Newport, 57.

MORIER, Sir R., and Count H. Bismarck, correspondence, 1 [2-4].

MORLEY, Earl of, Chairman of Committees, 16.

MOSQUE, Mahomedan, at Woking, 89.

MUMMY unrolled at University College, 61.

MURDERS in Nicaragua and Jamaica, 4.

MUSIC, retrospect of.—CHAMBER music, 97.

CRYSTAL Palace, "Etijah," 98.

ENGLISH Opera, 95.

HALLÉ, Sir C., and Sefi. Sarasate concerts, 97.

ITALIAN Opera, 94.

MUSIC, retrospect of, *continued*.

- LEEDS, Sixth Triennial Festival, 97
 LONDON Symphony Concerts, 96
 MONDAY Popular Concerts, 97
 NOVELLO'S Choir, 97
 PHILHARMONIC Concerts, 96
 RICHTER Concerts, 96
 ROYAL Choral Society, 97
 MUSWELL Hill, burglary, 2

- NATIONAL Liberal Union, Manchester, 19
 — Union of Conservative Associations at Nottingham, 57
 — Portrait Gallery, offer to build, 21;
 Scotch, opened, 33

- Rifle Association, at Wimbledon, 84,
 85; site selected, 10
 NAVAL Manœuvres, Ushant, 42

NETHERLANDS, the.—ARMY [344].

- ELECTORAL contest [345]; Emma,
 Queen, Regent [348]. FACTORY law
 [345]. KING'S illness [343]. 14. NAS-
 SAU, Duke of, Regent [345]. 17. PRU-
 SIAN Instruction Bill [344]; proposed
 strategical railway [346]. SOCIALIST
 agitation [345]

- NEW GUINEA.—MACGREGOR, Sir W.,
 exploration [478]

- NEW River Company "Adventurer's"
 share sold, 84

- NEW SOUTH WALES.—ADDRESS [459];
 Budget [457]. [460]; deep borings
 for water [461]; Federation question
 [460]; heavy rains [461]; inter-
 colonial cricket match [461]; Land
 Bill [457]; Parliament new [456];
 Payment of Members Bill [458], 46;
 Prof. Pasteur's scheme [461]; revenue
 [455]; River Murray [459]

- NEW ZEALAND.—EXPORT trade [478];
 Jervois, Sir W., departure [472]; On-
 slow, Earl of, successor [472]; Parlia-
 mentary session [472], 86; revenue
 [478]

- NEWCASTLE, Duke of, marriage, 9

- NILE, its low water, 9

- NONCONFORMIST Cathedral, Islington,
 opened, 61

- NORWAY.—BUDGET [362]; educational
 reform [363]; jury system [362];
 mail and passenger service grant
 [364]; Ministry, new [364]; Nansen,
 Dr. F., return [365]; Paris Exhibition
 [363]; Stordlung opened [361]; Sver-
 drup, Mr., downfall of his Ministry
 [361]. [364]

- OBITUARY.—ADAMS, Sir F. O., 149;
 Allen, S., 162; Allingham, W., 165;
 Anderson, C. H., 153; Anzenberger,
 L., 176; Arbuthnot, Sir W. W., 146;
 Arinori, Viset. M., 121; Arkwright, L.
 W., 144; Armstrong, Capt. J. W., 176;
 Ashburton, Lord, 149; Augier, E., 162;
 Ayre, Gen. H., 140.

- BABINGTON, Rev. C., 117; Baillie, Ad.
 the Hon. T., 150; Baillie-Hamilton, K.,
 120; Baker, Lieut.-Col. F. J., 118;
 Ball, J., 160; Barlow, Sir M., 140;
 Barlow, T. O., 176; Bateman, J. F. La
 T., 148; Beal, Rev. S., 158; Bellingham,
 Sir A. E., 141; Benares, Maharajah of,

OBITUARY, *continued*.

- 148; Bentinck, Lady R. A., 156; Ber-
 nard, Rev. W., 135; Bery, D., 167;
 Bersier, E., 167; Betty, Lieut.-Col. W.
 T. K., 167; Bevan, G. P., 152; Birch-
 Reynardson, C. T. S., 142; Blackford,
 Lord, 165; Blanchard, E. L., 156;
 Blaquiére, Baron de, 167; Blount, Lady
 C. J., 161; Boscawen, Hon. and Rev.
 J. T., 150; Boyd, Rev. Sir F., 118;
 Boyd, E. F., 153; Brabourne, Lady,
 145; Bradford, Gen. Sir J. F., 141;
 Bradley, Rev. E., 176; Bradstreet, Sir
 J. V., 167; Bramston, Very Rev. J.,
 167; Bright, Rt. Hon. J., 125; Brodie
 of Bodge, H. F. A., 154; Browne, Col.
 C. H., 141; Browning, R., 172; Bruce,
 K. M., 175; Buckingham, Duke of,
 124; Burges, J. Y., 141; Burgess, W.,
 162; Butler, H., 135

- CABANEL, A., 118; Cafredo, J. M. T.,
 156; Cairn, Sig. B., 150; Caithness,
 Earl of, 145; Cambridge, H.R.H.
 Duchess of, 138; Campbell, Lord W.,
 144; Cates, J. M., 118; Carbery,
 Baron, 168; Carlisle, Earl of, 138;
 Carnwath, Countess of, 144; Caux,
 Marg. de, 176; Cecil, Lord A. P., 145;
 Cecil, Lord F. H. P., 147; Chandler,
 Prof. H. W., 145; Charles III., Prince
 of Monaco, 156; Cheney, E. H., 147;
 Chevreul, M., 139; Christie-Miller, S.,
 140; Clarke-Jervois, Sir J., 140; Clay,
 F., 168; Clerk, Sir G. R., 149; Clive,
 Lady M. W., 150; Cobbett, Miss S.,
 120; Coimbra, Duke of, 156; Coke,
 Hon. E. K. W., 145; Collins, Rev. J.
 F., 152; Collins, W. W., 154; Col-
 quhoun-Goodwin-Craven, G. C., 147;
 Conolly, Lieut.-Col. J. A., 118; Cook,
 E., 156; Cooke, M. A. G., 156; Cosson,
 Maj. E. A. de, 146; Coulanges, F. de,
 156; Cowan, C., 138; Crawford, R. W.,
 150; Crosse, Rev. F. T., 117; Crossley,
 J. T., 142.

- DAKIN, Ald. Sir T., 145; Dallas-Glyn,
 Mrs., 145; Damien de Venster, Father,
 139; Daniell, Lieut.-Gen. C. F. T.,
 150; D'Arcy, M. P., 168; Dashwood,
 Sir H. W., 116; Dashwood, Lady E.,
 145; Davidson, Col., 138; Davis, J.,
 168; Dawson, Hon. G. C., 120; Day,
 Dep. Sur.-Gen. F., 150; Dickson, Maj.
 A. G., 148; Digby, Baron E. St. V.,
 162; Donegall, Earl of, 115; Doria,
 W., 162; Drummond, J. M., 145; Du
 Cane, Sir C., 120; Duff, Hon. G. S.,
 135; Duffield, C. P., 141; Dunbar, Sir
 W., 174; Duncombe, Adm. the Hon.
 A., 120; Dunsany, Lord, 119; Durham,
 Bishop of, 175

- EASTWICK, Capt. W. J., 119; Edersheim,
 Rev. A., 135; Edgell, Col. R. J., 168;
 Edwards, Rev. B., 121; Edwards, C.,
 121; Effingham, Earl of, 120; Elkington,
 Lieut.-Gen. J. H. F., 121; Ely,
 Marg. of, 140; Ericsson, J., 134; Evans,
 Rev. T. S., 145; Evelyn, Col. G. F.,
 135; Ewart, Sir W., 152

- FAIDHERBE, Gen. L. L. C., 158; Fal-
 mond, Vist. 163; Falshaw, Sir J., 148;
 Feversham, Lady, 134; Firth, J. F. B.,
 155; Fitz-Gerald, Lord, 153; Fitz-

OBITUARY, *continued.*

Maurice, Lieut.-Col. Hon. W. E., 146; Fitzwilliam, Hon. W. J., 156; Fleury, J. H., 176; Flower, Lady, 120; Fordham, E. K., 184; Frances, E., 161; Frank, E., 158; Fraser, Lord, 186; Frederika Maria, Queen Dow. of Bavaria, 145

GAGE, Lieut.-Gen. Hon. E. T., 145; Ganglbauer, Dr. C., Card. Archbp. of Vienna, 176; Gavazzi, Father A., 117; Gladstone, Sir T., 123; Goldsmid, Miss A. M., 121; Gooch, Sir D., 158; Gordon, Sir J. D., 148; Gordon, J., 167; Gordon, Dame R. E., 118; Granard, Earl of, 151; Granville, Lady C. A., 144; Gray, Maj. B., 176; Grey, Hon. and Rev. A. de, 167; Guilbert, Mons. A. V. F., 153

HABERSHON, S. O., 153; Haddington, Countess of, 146; Hall, S. G., 123; Halliwell-Phillips, J. O., 115; Hamilton, Gen. C., 162; Hanbury-Tracy, Hon. H., 140; Harvey, Rev. R., 148; Hatch, E., 164; Havet, E. A. A., 176; Hawkins, Lieut.-Col. T. S., 161; Hawley, F., 185; Hennessy, W. M., 117; Heron, Sir J., 176; Hevland, Col. A. R., 168; Hicks, E., 118; Holland, Lady, 154; Howard, J., 118; Hubbard, J. G., 152; Hueffer, F., 115; Hughes, Sir F., 120; Hughes, Sir T. C., 145; Hughes, Rt. Rev. J., 116; Hughes, J., 148; Hunt, Sir H. A., 117; Hurdle, Maj.-Gen. Sir T., 147; Hutt, Maj.-Gen. Sir G., 162; Hutton-Croft, G. A., 140; Hylton-Joliffe, Com. Hon. W., 141

INCE, H. B., 144

JACKSON, Col. B., 162; Jaques, R. M., 148; Jeffeys, Gen. E. R., 140; Jerningham, Adm. A. W., 167; John of Abyssinia, King, 187; Johnson, Maj.-Gen. A. C., 176; Johnston, G., 184; Johnstone, H. J. W., 168; Joule, J. P., 157; Jung, Sir S., 149

KAROLYI, Count A., 177; Kavanagh, Rt. Hon. A. M., 177; Keith-Falconer, Maj. Hon. C., 117; Kennedy, Dr., 186; Kidd, J. B., 144; King-Harman, Com. G. L., 168; Knight, Sir C. F. S., 176; Kraefsky, A. A., 153

LANYON, Sir C., 146; Lea, Ven. W., 156; Leatham, W. H., 167; Lebrun, Gen., 161; Lees, Maj.-Gen. D. N., 184; Leigh, P., 162; Leven and Melville, Earl of, 162; Lewald, F., 152; Lindsay, Hon. C. H., 185; Lisle-Adams, Comte A. V. de, 153; Littleton, Hon. W. F., 144; Livingstone, W. O., 177; Llanos, F., 176; Longfield, Gen. J., 121; Longfield, R., 148; Luis I., King of Portugal, 159; Lushington, Lady, 185; Lyster, Lady C. B., 176; Lyttelton, Hon. S., 120

MAC DONALD, J. C., 171; Mackay, C., 176; Macnaghten, Col. W. H., 148; McDonald, Rt. Rev. J., 120; McDonnell, Dr. R., 144; McLeod, Maj.-Gen. F. H., 148; McNair, W. W., 153; Malmesbury, Earl of, 143; Mann, Col. A. D., 167; Marnock, R., 167; Marshall, Sir J., 152; Marshall, F. A., 176; Manie, Sir J. B., 162; Maxwell, Gen.

OBITUARY, *continued.*

A., 184; Menzies, S., 118; Mitchell, Miss M., 147; Mifford, W. T., 141; Molesworth, Sir P. W., 176; Monk, W. H., 184; Monteagle, Dow. Lady M. A., 141; Montmorency, Vist. F. de, 177; Moore, Rev. E., 145; Moore, Col. H. G., 161; Motte, P. H. de la, 121; Mountashell, Earl, 167; Muirhead, J., 167; Mundy, Maj.-Gen. P. H., 119

NEWALL, R. S., 141; Newton, Gen. W. S., 162; Noble, Com. W. B., 185; Norquay, Hon. J., 149; Nugent, Maj. A., 141

O'BRIEN, Hon. Mrs., 134; O'Connor, J., 145; O'Donel, Sir G. C., 116; O'Donoghue of the Glens, D. J., 185; Ogilvie-Giant, Hon. Mrs., 140; Opdebeeck, Lady S. H. C., 168; Orkney, Earl of, 160; Ormond, F., 144; Osborne, Lord S. G., 142; Ossington, Viscountess C., 156; Ouseley, Rev. Sir F. G., 138; Ouseley, Col. J. W. J., 163; Owsen, Sir T. S. O., 117; Oxford, Bp. of, 153

PAKENHAM, Rear-Adm. Hon. T. A., 117; Parker-Browne, Lieut.-Col. B., 148; Parkinson, Rev. S., 117; Patey, C. H. B., 186; Paton, Gen. J. S., 168; Patti, Mdme. C., 148; Peacock, R., 184; Pellegrini, C., 118; Pendleton, G. H., 168; Percival, C. A., 118; Percy, J., 148; Peto, Sir S. M., 167; Petre, Hon. H. W., 175; Phillips, Sir B. S., 162; Philpot, Ven. B., 145; Pleton, Sir J. A., 150; Plates, Count L., 141; Playdell-Bouverne, Sir J., 184; Playdell-Bouverne, Rt. Hon. E., 172; Plunkett, Lady, 167; Plunkett, T. O. W., 176; Pollen, Lieut. W. H., 186; Pollock, H., 145; Pomfret, Dow. Countess, 150; Portal, Rev. G. R., 140; Portarlington, Earl of, 184; Porter, Rev. J. L., 122; Powell, W. R. H., 147; Pryor, R., 158; Pyat, F., 152

RAILTON, W. R. S., 152; Ranken, W. B., 140; Rawle, Rt. Rev. R., 144; Rickards, Sir G. K., 156; Riddell, H. P. A. B., 118; Robertson, Sir W. T., 156; Robertson-Eustace, Col., 186; Robertson, J., 161; Robinson, Adm. Sir R. S., 150; Robinson, Lady L., 117; Rosa, C., 142; Rudolph of Austria, Archduke, 116; Rue, W. De la, 141

SABURO, His Excell. S., 148; Sacconi, Card., 121; Scherer, E. H. A., 122; Shadwell, R. J., 156; Shafto, R. D. H., 135; Sharpe, M. R., 145; Sheffield, H., Dow. Countess, 117; Shelley, Sir P. F., 176; Sikes, Sir C. W., 162; Stawell, W. F., 184; Stewart, Sir A. A. J., 158; Streatfeild, Col. H. D., 140; Street, Gen. J. A., 176; Stuart, Gen. J. R., 162; Surtees, W. E., 121; Swanborough, M. A., 117

TAMBERLIK, Sig., 185; Tayler, F., 148; Teynham, Baron, 162; Theresa, C. M., ex-Emp. of Brazil, 177; Thrupp, Vice-Adm. A. T., 144; Tidman, P. F., 118; Tolstoi, Count D. A., 142; Tomline, Col. G., 153; Torrington, Vist., 160; Tufts, Maj.-Gen. H. M., 117; Tupper, M. F., 166; Turville, Sir F. F., 176

ULBACH, L., 141

OBITUARY, *continued.*

- VAYASOUR, Lady Hon. L. A., 144;
 Vigfussen, G., 118; Vincent, S., 166;
 Voss, Mrs. C., 150
 WAKEFIELD, W. H., 167; Waldie-
 Griffith, Sir G. R., 144; Walker, T. A.,
 168; Walrod, Sir J. W., 141; War-
 burton, Maj. P. E., 164; Warter, Col.
 H. de G., 135; Wells, W., 144; West-
 garth, W., 168; Whately, M., 184;
 White, Maj. J., 144; Wigram, L. T.,
 154; Wilhams, Dame J. M., 156;
 Willoughby De Broke, Dow. Lady,
 134; Wilson-Patten, J. A., 167; Witt,
 C. de, 176; Wolseley, Sir C. J., 162;
 Wolseley, Dow. Lady A. E., 141;
 Wood, Rev. J. G., 121; Wood, Adm. W.,
 156; Woolley, J., 185; Wright, Dr. W.,
 145; Wynyard, Gen. E., 156
 YORKE, J., 120; Yule, Col. Sir H., 177
 OMNIBUS and Tramways Employés Union,
 meeting to consolidate, 48
 ORMONDE, Duke of Westminster's racer,
 sold, 46
 "OUTDANOS" on Foreign Policy [202];
 Sig. Crisp's reply [208]

PAISLEY Abbey, monument to the Royal
 Stuarts unveiled, 60

PAOLI, Gen. T., remains removed, 42
 PARIS, Comte and Comtesse de, silver
 wedding, 24

PARLIAMENT.—OPENING of [23].
 QUEEN'S SPEECH [28]; Address in
 the Lords [24]; attack on the Attorney-
 Gen. [61]; Lords' Committee, Chairman
 [71]; new Radical Party [79];
 recess, Easter [89]; fourth session
 opened, 9; prorogued [175], 42; close
 [260]

ADDRESS, debate in House of Lords [24];
 in the Commons [26]; Mr. Gladstone
 on [26]; Mr. Morley's amendment
 [28]; Mr. Balfour's reply [29]; Mr.
 Chamberlain [29]; Mr. Gladstone
 [30]; Mr. Goschen [31]; Mr. Parnell
 [32]; closed [33]. II. AGRICULTURAL
 Tenants (Ireland) Bill [65]. AGRICULTURE
 Bill, Board of [124]. ANTI-
 VIVISECTION debate [115]. APPROPRIATION
 Bill [174]. ARMY estimates
 [48]

BUDGET, the [52]. BYE-elections [141]
 CIVIL Service Estimates [51], [95]. Dr.
 CLARKE's Bill, 17. COLONIAL Vote
 [97]. CORPORAL Punishment Bill
 [106]. COUNTY Councils election [4, 5]

DECEASED Wife's Sister Bill [105], 21.
 DOCK Labourers' Strike [177-181].
 DRAINAGE Bill, Irish [123]

EDUCATION, new code [105]; statistics
 [172]. ESTATE Duty on Personality
 [96]

FALCARRACH evictions [98]

HORSKPLESH (Sale of Food) Bill [97]

INDIAN Budget [174]. IRISH Constabulary
 Vote [175]

LAND Transfer Bill [146], 29, 31.

LARGENT Amendment Bill [120].

LEASEHOLDS Enfranchisement Bill

[96]. LIGHT Railways (Ireland) Bill
 [165], 40. LIQUOR traffic in India

PARLIAMENT, *continued.*

[96]; in Africa [98]. LONDON Coal
 Duties [116]; strikes [235]

NATIONAL Debt Bill [115]. National
 Defence [34]. National Portrait Gallery,
 Bill for site [145]. Naval Defence Bill

[99], [120], 21. NAVY estimates [41]

PREVENTION of Cruelty to Children
 Bill [142], [172]. PRINCE of Wales's
 Children Bill [159]. PRISONERS in

Ireland, Bill to Amend Treatment [64]

ROYAL Grants [154-159], 36. ROUND
 Table Conference [21]

SECRETARY for Scotland Bill [105].
 SEAGRAVE case [59]. SCOTCH Local
 Government Bills [121], [150]. SCOTCH
 Universities Bill [142]; in Committee

[150]. SCOTTISH Bills [66]. SUNDAY
 Closing Bill, 15

TECHNICAL Instruction Bill [178].
 TITHES Bill [165]

UNIVERSITY representation [106]

WELSH Intermediate Education Bill
 [108]. WESTERN Australia, Bill for
 Representative Government [152]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, ELEC-
 TIONS, &c.—ARGYLL, Duke of,
 disaffection in Ireland [152]. ASQUITH,
 Mr., and the Attorney-General [68]

BALFOUR, Mr. A. J., treatment of Irish
 prisoners [29]; at Manchester [54].

[210]; Mr. Harrison's arrest [98]; at
 Willis's Rooms [103]; reply to Mr.
 Campbell-Bannerman [121]; Irish

Drainage Bills [128], [145]; at Bir-
 mingham, 16; light railways [124];
 at Portsmouth [139]; reply to Mr.
 Gladstone [143]; at Salisbury [166];

Irish Constabulary Vote [178]; Rom.
 Cath. University Education [175]; at
 Ipswich [227]; in Scotland [248].

BAILEY, Sir J., Church in Wales [107].
 BAUMANN, Mr., Coal Duties [116].

BRAUCHAMP, Lord, Horseflesh Bill
 [97]. BERESFORD, Lord C., naval
 programme [37]; letter to the *Times*

[41]; Naval Defence Bill [100].
 BRADLAUGH, Mr., amendment nega-
 tive, 31; perpetual pensions [113].

BRASSEY, Lord, at the Mansion House
 [18]. BROADHURST, Mr., condition of
 the poor in large towns [65]. BRYCE,
 Mr., Scotch Universities Bill [142].

BURDETT-COUTTS, Mr., Coal Duties
 [116]. BUXTON, Mr., the slave trade
 [66]

CAINE, Mr., Indian Government [96].
 CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr., Navy
 programme [45]; Scotch Local Govern-
 ment Bills [121]. CANTERBURY, Aich-

bishop of, new code for education [105].
 CARNARVON, Lord, Bill for Reforming
 the House of Lords [69], 14; Armenian
 outrages [146]. CASTLETOWN, Lord,
 Delagoa Bay [151]. CHAMBERLAIN,
 Mr., reply to Mr. Morley [97]; educa-
 tion scheme [12]; in Scotland [15];
 tribute to Mr. Bright [81], [91];
 censure to Lord R. Churchill [86]; at
 Bacup [127]; Royal Grants [158];
 Liberal Union Club, Greenwich [171];
 on Lord R. Churchill's programme
 [176]; Liberal Unionist Association

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

[182], Huddersfield, [191], 45; Newcastle [197]; Plymouth [207]; Bodmin [209]. CHAPLIN, Mr., bi-metallism [125]. CHILDERS, Mr., Death Duties [56]. CHURCHILL, Lord R., Naval Defence Fund [36]; letter to the *Times* [89]; to Mr Chamberlain [84]; at Walsall [169], 87; Newtown [163]; Perth [200]. COURFENEY, Mr. L., at Liskeard [195]; Saltash [205]; St. Germans and Plymouth [206]. COZENS HARDY, Mr., investment of trust funds [69]. CRAIG-SELLAR, Mr., Scotch Universities Bill [142]. CRANBROOK, Lord, new Education Code [106]. CREMER, Mr., Navy estimates [48]; amendment [46]. CRILLEN, Mr., Agricultural Tenants (Ireland) Bill [65]. CUNINGHAM-GRAHAM, Mr., Labour Conference, Bernie [145], 29. CURZON, Mr., hereditary legislators [114].

DERBY, Lord, at Ashton-under-Lyne [11]; Birmingham [89]; Liberal Union Club [101], on Federalism [48]. DILLWYN, Mr., Colonial Vote [97]; Church in Wales [107]. DYKE, Sir W. H., Welsh Education Bill [108].

ELECTIONS.—Birmingham, Central [18]. Brighton [195], 51; Bucks, North, [195], 49; Burnley, 91; Carmarthen-shire, West, 84; Dover [141]; Dundee [194], 46; Elgin and Nairn [194], 48; Fife, West, 32; Govan district, Lancashire, 4; Lambeth, Kensington division, 12; Lancashire, Gorton division, 14; Lincolnshire, Sleaford division, 46; Marylebone, East, 34; Middlesex, Enfield division, 15; Perthshire, East, 8; Peterborough [195], 48; Rochester, 18; Yorkshire, Barnsley division, 12. ELLIS, Mr., evictions in Ireland [148]. ERRINGTON, Sir G., at Dublin [102].

FENWICK, Mr., payment of members [66]. FERGUSSON, Sir J., Labour Conference, Bernie [145]. FORWOOD, Mr., requirements of the Navy [45]. FOWLER, Mr. H., Naval Defence Bill [89]; at Coventry [286]. FREEMAN, Professor, Home Rule [200].

GLADSTONE, Mr., Navy estimates [47]; tribute to Mr. Bright [80]; action of the police in Ireland [99]; Welsh Education Bill [108]; perpetual pensions [118]; in Devonshire and Cornwall [129-189]; Cardiff [162]; Royal Grants [157]; letter to Lord Aberdeen [162]; at Hawarden [198]; Southport [214]; Southampton, 26; Falmouth, 27; Stockport, 51; Manchester [247], 58. GOSSETT, Sir J., Indian Government [96]; opium in China [97]; Indian budget [174]. GOSCHEN, Mr., at Stratford [18]; third budget, 18, [52], [56]; financial statement [55]; perpetual pensions [118]; at Sheffield [118]; Liberal Union Club [126]; Hanley [147]; desertion of Mr. Gladstone's followers [159]; at Hull [218]; Blackpool [221]; Bristol [229]; South Wales [232].

HAMILTON, Lord G., naval programme

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

[84], 11; Navy estimates [41], [45]. HANLEY, Sir E., national defences [50]. HANBURY, Mr., perpetual pensions [118]. HARCOURT, Sir W., vote of, censure on the Attorney-General [61], 14; at Derby [21]; his "serious charges" [57]; at Ely [75]; Bromley [104]; Hereford [166]; Salisbury [198]; Camarvon [211]; National Liberal Club [212]; Stratford-by-Bow [229]. HARTINGTON, Lord, at Sunderland, 18; Norwich [72]; Holloway Hall [75]; Birmingham [92]; Bury [109]; Federal Home Rule [160]; at Ilkley [184]; Aberdeen [196]; Stirling [199]; Wolverhampton [217]; Bacup [254]. HARTLAND, Mr., supervision of theatres, &c. [108]. HAVELOCK-ALLAN, Sir H., national defences [51]. HERSHELL, Lord, at Durham [205]; Ipswich [226]. HICKS-BEACH, Sir M., at West Bristol [6]; Bristol [280].

JAMES, Sir H., at Bury [111]. JENNINGS, Mr., Foreign Office Vote [97].

KNUTSFORD, Lord, on Sir H. Robinson's resignation [126].

LABOUCHERE, Mr., Civil Service estimates [95]; Naval Defence Bill [99]; hereditary legislators [114], 22; royal grants [167], 86; at Bexhill [200]. LEA, Mr., sale of Irish estates belonging to London companies [145]. LEIGHTON, Mr., Welsh Education Bill [108].

MACDONALD, Rt Hon J. H. A., Scottish Bills [66]. MACLEAN, Mr. J., mono-metallic system [125]. MATTHEWS, Mr., reply to Sir W. Harcourt [58]; Pigott's letter [59]; Coal Duties [16]; at Birmingham [308]. MEATH, Lord, Bill to elect women County Councillors [97]. MORGAN, Mr. G. O., Church in Wales [107]. MORLEY, Lord, Chairman of the Lords' Committee [71]. MORLEY, Mr. J., amendment on Address, 10; at Sheffield [6], 4; Newcastle [14]; Portsmouth [18]; Royal Grants, 37; Committee on the Tithes Bill, 39; at the Eighty Club [237], 56; attack on Mr. Balfour [60]; national protest meeting [73]; Bedford [94]; Shore-ditch [113]; Bristol [219]; Middlesborough [222]; in Scotland [252].

PAINE, Mr., at the Eighty Club [73]; National Protest Meeting [74]; Women's Liberal Federation [117]; Irish deputations [119]; Edinburgh [161]; Land League [168]; at Nottingham [256], 60; Liverpool [256], [259], 61. PICKERSGILL, Mr., excessive pensions [122]. PICTON, Mr., Army estimates [50]. PLAYFAIR, Sir L., Scotch Universities Bill [148].

RAIKES, Mr., Church in Wales [107]. REDMOND, Sir J., at Dublin [102]. REED, Sir E., Navy estimates [44]. REED, Mr. B., Church in Wales [107]. RENDEL, Mr., Welsh Education Bill [108]. RITCHIE, Mr., at Dundee [181]; Mansion House [244]. ROBERTSON, Lord Advocate, Scotch Universities Bill [142]. ROBERTSON, Mr. E., with-

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

drawal of the British Ambassador from Paris [123]. ROSEBERRY, Lord, at Scarborough [12]; Edinburgh [19]; on Imperial Federation [175]; Bistol [231]; Mansion House [234]; Glasgow [239].
 SALISBURY, Lord, at Watford [76]; tribute to Mr. Bright [80]; Primrose League [117]; Naval Defence Bill [120]; position of missionaries in East Africa [121]; affairs in Crete [146]; Delagoa Bay Railway Company [146]; Armenia [147]; at the Mansion House [170]; Guildhall banquet [224]; Nottingham [241]. SAWYER, Sir J., Central Birmingham contest [82]. SELBORNE, Lord, at Huddersfield [191], 45. SEXTON, Mr., and the Attorney-General [63]; salaries of teachers in primary schools [174]. SMITH, W. H., Farnell Commission [57]; perpetual pensions [118]; Board of Agriculture Bill [124]; Tuesday sittings [141], St. James's Hall [152]; provision for members of the Royal Family [154], [158]; and the Scotch Conservatives [228]. SMITH, Mr. S., liquor traffic in India [96], 20; opium trade in China [97]. SMITH-BARRY, Mr., evictions in Ireland [148]. SPENCER, Earl, at the Eighty Club [72]; Bury [205]; Stockton [212]; Lancaster [218]. STANHOPE, Mr. E., Army estimates [49]; vote for Volunteers [142]. STANSFELD, Mr., Church in Wales [108]. STOREY, Mr., Bann Drainage Bill [145].
 TREVELYAN, Sir G., at Glasgow [18], [288]; Army organisation [50]; at Hexham [196]; Fraserburgh [218]. WALLACE, Mr., hereditary legislators [114]; Scotch Universities Bill [143]. WEBSTER, Sir R., Farnell Commission [62]. WESTMINSTER, Duke of, liquor traffic [98]. WILLIAMS, Mr. A., Welsh Education Bill [108]. WOLMER, Lord, Army estimates [50]. WOLSELEY, Lord, at Birmingham [12], [18], 5; at Oxford [108].
 PARNELL, Mr., Scotch action against the *Times*, 6; freedom of the city of Edinburgh, 19, 34; at Liverpool presented with 8,500*l.*, 61.
 — Commission [477-507], Mr. W. O'Brien and Hon. G. Brodrick, charges dismissed, 8; *Times'* case withdrawn, 9; closed for a fortnight, 12; close of Sir C. Russell's speech, 17; proceedings withdrawn, 34; adjourned, 36; sittings resumed, 61; 128th meeting, 56.
 PAUL'S, St., Reredos case, 61.
 PAUNCEFOOT, Sir F., Minister at Washington, 11.
 PERSEA.—DEMANDS of Russia [369]. Shah at Berlin, 26; in England, 31, 32; at Invercauld, 34, Osborne, 37; left Paris, 39; train wrecked, 43.
 PETERBOROUGH Cathedral, sexton committed suicide, 53.
 PHELPS, Mr., banquet to, 4.
 — Mrs., presented with diamond bracelet, 4.

PIGOTT, R., warrant for apprehension, 9; suicide, 10.
 PIZARRO, F., coffin discovered, 3.
 POLICE, Chief Commissioner's report, 34.
 POLLOCK, Dr. J., Harveian Oration, 50.
 POLYNESIA.—SAMOAN difficulty [474]; hurricane [475]; restoration of King Mahetooa [476]; Molokai, death of Father Damien [476].
 PORTUGAL.—AFRICAN question [357]; Braganza, House of, extinguished [357]; Cabinet, new members [356]; financial situation [358]; King's speech [355]; death [357], 50; funeral, 52; Nyassaland claimed, 60; Pope's authority [356]; Serpa Pinto's action [358]; Dom Carlos succession [357], 62.
 POWSMAN robbed, 60.
 PRESS, opinions, Lord R. Churchill at New, town [188], [188]; Lord Hartington at Ilkley [185].
 PRIMROSE League meeting [107], 23.
 PRIZE-fight, Bruges, 61; Richburg, 82.
 PROCESSION, docks to Hyde Park, 41.

QUEEN VICTORIA, received two Zambesi chiefs, 10; left for Cherbourg and Biarritz, 11; visit to the Queen of Spain, 14; return to Windsor, 16; statue unveiled, University of London, 21; laid the memorial stone of the new school building in Keate's Lane, 22; statue unveiled, Roy. Col. Physicians, 23; at Aldershot, 25; presented colours to 2nd battalion, 25; witnessed the "Procession of Boats" 25; reviewed the German fleet, 39; Hon. Colonel of the Queen of England's Own, 39; at Palé Hall, 41; leaves for Scotland, 42.
 QUEENSFERRY railway bridge opened, 88.

QUEENSLAND.—BILLS passed [466]; financial statement [466]; floods [468]; legislation [467]; Norman, Sir H., Gov. [466]; Parliament opened [466]; yield of gold [468].

RACES.—ASCOT, 28; CHANTILLY, 25; CITY and Suburban Handicap, 19; CYCLIST Club, 44; DONCASTER, 44; EPSOM, 19, 26; GOODWOOD, 37; GRAND Prix de Paris, 27; GREAT Yorkshire Handicap, 44; HENLEY Regatta, 31; INTERNATIONAL Sculling, 44; UNIVERSITY Racquet, 16; KEMPTON Park, 21, 22, 48; LANCASTERSHIP Plate, 4; LINCOLNSHIRE Handicap, 14; LIVERPOOL, 15, 36; MELBOURNE, 2; MIDDLE Park Plate, 49; NEWMARKET, 20, 23, 49, 51; OXFORD and Cambridge Boat-race, 15; PORTLAND Stakes, 34; PRINCE of Wales's Stakes, 16; SANDOWN Park, 34; THAMES Sculling Match, 50; TWO Thousand Guineas Stakes, 20; WATERLOO Cup, 9.

RADICAL Union Conference, 12.
 RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—ARIANO, 47; Armagh, 27; Belgium, 7; Brussels and Namur, 5; Canada, 9; Chesapeake and Ohio Rly., 62; Chicago, 20, Holy-

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, *continued.*

head Station, 11; Huddersfield, 15; Knoxville, 41; London and North-Western Rly., 48; Munich, 32; New York Central Rly., 47; North-Eastern Rly., 40; Wildpath, 47

— Communication between Brisbane and Adelaide, 20

RAILWAYS, official returns, 45

"RALEIGH," the, and two other ships ordered to Delagoa Bay, 61

RAMSLADE, Ascot, burglary, 5

RATS, invasion of, 60

REDDISH, E. J., swam from Blackwall Pier to Gravesend, 42

RICE, Capt., R.N., acquitted, 17

RICHARDSON, the novelist, memorial brass unveiled, 57

ROCHDALE School-board offices, attempt to blow up, 58

ROTHSCHILD, Lord de, Lord-Lieut. of Bucks, 22

ROUMANIA. — BUCHAREST, 500th anniversary of the battle of Kossovo, 29; Cabinet, new [387]; Ferdinand, Crown Prince [386], [389], 14; Russian intrigues [389]

ROYAL Agricultural Show in Windsor Great Park, 29

— Colonial Institute, 21st anniversary, 12

— Naval School transferred to Chislehurst, 34

— Society, medals conferred, 58

RUBINSTEIN, A., official jubilee, 58

RUSSIA. — ARMY, reorganisation [322].

BALTIC Provinces, Russian language obligatory [321]; Budget [320].

CZAR and Gr. Duke George at Berlin, 49; Ludwigsburg, 49. DOLGOROUKI, Prince, envoy to Persia [324].

Nihilist outbreak [320], secret societies discovered, 22, 24.

Pr. PETERSBURG, Czar and Czarina at Sir R. Morier's ball, 9; Prince of Montenegro toasted, 24; Imperial Theatre stripped of its fittings, 11; marriage of Gr. Duke Paul, 27; Schouvaloff, Count P., funeral, 14.

Siberian prisoners, slaughter [321].

WARSAW Courts litigation terminated, 48

SAGALLO, the "Free Cossacks" conveyed to Odessa, 8

SALISBURY, Lord, deputation of merchants and shipowners, 1; concerning the Ld.-Lieutenancy of Ireland [128]; banquet, Guildhall, 54

SALVATION Army, collision with the police, 29

SAMARITAN Free Hospital, memorial stone laid, 36

SANDHURST, Lady, incapacitated from sitting in the London County Council, 18

SCHARICH, Mrs., degree of M.D., 22

SCIENCE, retrospect of:—

ASTRONOMY, 109

BIOLOGY, 104

CHEMISTRY, 102

GEOGRAPHY, 113

GEOLOGY, 107

MECHANICS, 99

PHYSICS, 100

SCOTLAND. — CALDWELL, Mr., report [264]; Crofters' Commissioners inquiry [263] EDINBURGH, Congress of the National Association for the Advancement of Art, 52; Liberal demonstration, 8

EMIGRATION [264]; Local Government Bill [263]; National Portrait Gallery inaugurated [264]

SERVIA. — ALEXANDER, anointed King [334], 30; Army, [335]; Belgrade riot, 24; Queen Natalie at, 47; Constitution, new [332], 1; King Milan's abdication [333], 11; visit as ex-King, 36; Manifesto [333]; Regents appointed [333]

SHERBORNE School, case to recover damages, 54

SHIPPING DISASTERS. — "BANSHEE" and "Irene" collision, 44; "Beresford" and "German Emperor" collision, 23; "Comtesse de Flandres" and "Princess Henrietta" collision, 15; "Denbighshire" and "Duke of Buckingham" collision, 4; Dungeness, two ships collision, 6; "Enterprise" driven ashore, 48; French torpedo boats, 14; "Ladybird" and "Alderney" collision, 48; "Largo Bay" and "Gloucester" collision, 6; "Leardam" and "Gaw Quan Sia" collision, 60; "Lily" struck on reef, 45; "Princess Henrietta" cylinder burst, 31; Samoan group, wrecks, 12; "Santiago" burnt at sea, 56; "Sultan" ashore at Comerio, 11; "Watchful" grounded in Lowestoft harbour, 59

SMITH, Mr. W. H., banquet at the Merchant Taylors' Hall, 17

SNOWDON sold to Sir E. W. Watkin, 32

SNOWSTORMS. — EUROPE and the British Isles, 7; Central Europe, 9; Lake district and Midlands, 57; Austria and Hungary, 58

SPAIN. — ALCOHOL tariff [358]; Barcelona, riots [354]; Brazil, revolution [355]; Budget [350]; Corroa, Señ., imprisoned, 20; Cortes, reassembling [352, 353]; Martos, Señ., resignation, [353]; Morocco, troubles in [354]; Parliamentary session [351]; Quesada, Marsh., death [351]; Sagasta's Ministry [351]; Universal Suffrage Bill [355]; winter session [354]

SPANISH Government, orders about Pope Leo XIII., 35; coasting vessel captured, 45; gun-boat ordered to the Riff Coast, 46

SPITHEAD Naval Review, 38

STANLEY, Mr. H., news of safety, 16

STIRLING, Miss, appeal dismissed, 2

STORMS. — NORTH Atlantic Coast, 44; Southern Hungary, 36

STRIKES. — BOARD Schools, Scotland, 48; brewers, Buxton-on-Trent, 55; cab-drivers, Paris, 27; dock labourers, London, 40, 45; Rotterdam, 47; Bristol, 51; gas-stokers, Bristol, 49, Manchester and Salford, 59, South Metropolitan, 59, 60; Jewish workmen, 43, 45; Kladno, Bohemia, 28; lightermen, London, 58; London Road

STRIKES, *continued*.

Car Company, 55; tailors, London, 43, 45, 48; mother-of-pearl workmen, Vienna, 55; tram-car drivers, Minneapolis (U.S.), 19; Vienna, 18, 19; Westphalian coal districts, 21, 23

"SULTAN" ashore at Comerio, 11; Court of Inquiry, 31; raised and brought into harbour, 42; arrived at Portsmouth, 61

SUN, total eclipse in N. America, 1

SWEDEN.—BUDGET [366]; Landtmanna party, new [366]; Ministry, new [368]; protective tariff [367]; Riksdag opened [366]; "Socialist Law" [367]

SWISS Federal Council, German Anarchists expelled, 50; concession for a railway up the Jungfrau, 51

SWITZERLAND.—ARMY [349]; asylum, right of [348]; quarrel with Germany [347]; Wohlgenuth, intrigues [346]

TANNER, D., arrested, 10

TASMANIA. — FINANCIAL statement [471]; Hobart Federal Council [472]; loan raised [472]; Main Line Railway Bill [471]; military defences [472]; New Victorian tariff [472]; Parliamentary session [471]

TELEGRAPH money orders, 41

TENNYSON, Lord, congratulations on his 80th birthday, 88

THAMES, low tide, 59; Battasea, mutilated remains found, 25

THOMPSON, H., case of [164]

THUNDERSTORMS.—Hong Kong, 24, 80; Hungary, 9; Lancashire, Cheshire, London, 25; Madrid, 26; New York, 27; Vienna, 22

TRADES Union Congress, Dundee [181], 48

TREASURY minute reorganising the Civil Service, 41

"Trooping of the Colours," and inspection of the London Fire Brigade, 24

TURKEY.—ARMENIA, anarchy and outrages, 41; atrocities [202]; Commission of Inquiry [326]; troubles with Crete [326]

UNIONIST Conference at Nottingham [241]

UNITED STATES. — BALLOT system [432]; Baltimore, Catholic Congress, 55; CAROLINA, S., negro prisoners lynched, 62; census [433]; Central Railway Board formed, 2; Chicago, Dr. Cronin [429-431], 23, 27, 51, 60; conspiracy, 49; Chinese Exclusion Act [425]; Conemaugh Valley disaster [426], 25; Congress, Acts of [425]; first session [434]; conferences [431], [432], 8. EXPORTS and imports [433]. "FALL" elections, 53; finance [434]; fur-seal fishery dispute [425], 37. HARRISON, Pres. [426], 10. LATHROP, Mr. D. Terry, shot, 40. NAVY [437];

UNITED STATES, *continued*.

New York, Electric Sugar Refining Co. collapsed, 1; streets in darkness, 50. OKLAHOMA, Kansas, 19. PANAMA Canal, 2; pensions [437]; President's Message [434], 59. QUEBEC, fall of rock, 45. SAMOAN Conference at Berlin [427]. WASHINGTON, Centenary [427], 20, 60; International Maritime Congress, 47, 50, 63

UNIVERSITY of London, report of the Royal Commissioners, 22

VICTORIA.—Acts passed [464]; Budget [463]; Centennial Exhibition [465]; defensive organisation [464]; general elections [462]; Hopetoun, Earl of, Gov. [462]; Imperial Federation [464]; Loch, Su H., departure [462]; obituary [465]; trade [465]

VIGNERONS, FÊTES DES, at Vevey, 38

VINCENT, Col. H., censured, 24

VOLUNTEER manoeuvres, 19

WALES, Prince of, at the banquet of the Roy. Col. Institute, 12

— and Princess, at Middlesbrough, 4; Paris Exhibition, 27

—, Princess Louise, betrothal, 29; marriage, 36

WATERLOO, remains of British officers removed to Evèr, 7

WATERLOW, Sir S., present of a public park, Highgate, 54

WEBSTER, Sir R., at the annual general meeting of the Bar, 18

WELSH Church, disestablishment [107]; Mr. Llewelyn on [189]

WEST INDIES. — BERMUDA, revenue [443], shipping [443]. CUBA, Salamanca, Gen. [442]; trade improvement [442], mines [442]. HAYTI, bombardment, 9; civil war ended, 41; constitution revised [442]; election [442]; Hippolyte, Gen., Pres., 50. JAMAICA, Blake, Sir H., Gov. [443]; Norman, Sir H., departure [443]; revenue [443]. TRINIDAD and Tobago, exports [443]

"W. WHITE" drifted from Delaware Bay to the Island of Lewis, 5

WHITECHAPEL, eighth murder, 34; body discovered, 44

WOMBWELL's Menagerie, escape of lion and lioness, 47

WOMEN's Hospital, foundation stone laid by the Princess of Wales, 21

— Liberal Federation soirée, 23

WOODWARD, Capt., arrested, 26; fined, 28

WURTEMBERG, Fr. W., fired at, 50

WYLLIE, Mr. W. L., Ass. of Roy. Academy, 4

ZAMBESILAND Co., charter of incorporation, 50